

The Review of English Studies

VOL. XIV.—No. 56.

OCTOBER, 1938.

TANCRED AND GISMUND¹

BY JOHN MURRAY

THE tragedy of *Tancred and Gismund*, the story of the cruel father and inauspicious stars, has been known for long; it was printed in the 1744 Dodsley, and has in more recent times had an appeal to scholars not only from its position in the development of English drama but also because of the existence of an earlier version, *Gismund of Salerne*. There is, therefore, a considerable amount of bibliographical material. The following sources for the text may be listed:

(a) The play of *Tancred and Gismund*, originally compiled by the Gentlemen of the Inner Temple, and by them performed before her Majesty, as the title-page states, now "newly revised and polished according to the *decorum* of these daies" by Robert Wilmot, was printed in only one known edition, by Thomas Scarlet for R. Robinson, quarto, London. There is no entry of this book in the Stationers' Register. The known copies are as follows:

- (1) Three copies in the British Museum—C. 34. e. 43, which is perfect, and has the date 1592 on the title-page; C. 34. e. 44, which lacks all the first sheet save the third leaf; and 161. k. 71, which lacks the title-page.
- (2) A copy in Eton College Library, lacking the title-page.

¹ The following abbreviated titles have been used in this essay:
T. and G. for *Tancred and Gismund*;
G. of S. for *Gismund of Salerne*;
P.M.L.A. for *Publications of the Modern Language Association*;
E.E.C.T. for *Early English Classical Tragedies*, ed. Cunliffe.

- (3) Copies in the Dyce Collection and the Bodleian Library, which are perfect and are dated 1592.
- (4) A copy in the Huntington Library in California (originally in the Bridgewater House Collection), which is similar in every respect to the others, save that the printer's mark is placed differently and the date is 1591.

(b) The earlier version of the play, *Gismond of Salerne in love*, exists in two manuscripts, both in the British Museum—Lansdowne 786, pp. 1-70, and Hargrave 205, pp. 9-22. W. W. Greg (in the Malone reprint of *T. and G.*) suggests that Wilmot had before him when writing his revision a version slightly different from either of these. He does not give his reasons for this; and the statement is a somewhat unsettling one, rendering difficult as it does any attempt to compare the earlier and the rewritten plays to study the advances in dramatic technique and requirements. But he may only be referring to a third manuscript, which we know to be lost—that mentioned by Isaac Reed in his note on p. 160 of the 1825 edition of Dodsley's *Old Plays*. He quotes "a specimen of it (*i.e. T. and G.*) in its original dress," and goes on to say: "It is here given from the fragment of an ancient MS. taken out of a chest of papers formerly belonging to Mr. Powell, father-in-law to the author of *Paradise Lost*, at Forest-Hill, about four miles from Oxford." The two surviving MSS. are very similar, though as Cunliffe points out in *E.E.C.T.*, p. 162, the Hargrave play has three scenes in the last act, the Lansdowne four.

The editorial history of *Tancred and Gismund* goes back to 1744, when it was printed in Dodsley. Editions are as follows:

- (1) Dodsley, *Old Plays*—1744 edition, vol. XI; 1780, vol. II (ed. Reed); 1825, vol. II (ed. Collier); 1874, vol. VII (ed. W. C. Hazlitt).
- (2) J. S. Farmer, in *Tudor Facsimile Texts* (Amersham), 1912.
- (3) W. W. Greg in the *Malone Society Reprints*, dated 1914 though Greg's own note is dated 1915.
- (4) Lamb quotes part of Gismund's long speech on receiving her lover's heart in his *Specimens*, of which it is Number II.

Gollancz in his edition of Lamb's *Specimens* (Dent, 1893, vol. I, p. 290) writes: "An edition, by the Editor of these volumes, is in preparation for the 'Tudor Library' (Nutt)." A prospective article by him is also noted in the *Tudor Facsimile Texts* edition

of MS. Hargrave 205. Both notes refer actually to *G. of S.* I do not know whether either project was carried out.

Gismond of Salerne has been published in the following editions :

- (1) Brandl, in *Quellen des Weltlichen Dramas*, prints and collates the two MSS. (1898).
- (2) J. W. Cunliffe, in *Early English Classical Tragedies*, Oxford, 1912, reprints the play.
- (3) The relevant portion of Hargrave 205 was reproduced in *Tudor Facsimile Texts*, 1912.

The story was worked over by Dryden in his *Fables (Segismonda and Guiscardo)*; a play, *Tancred and Sigismunda*, was written by Thomson (1743), and was published in Bell's *British Theatre* (1745), in the *New English Theatre*, and in a Scottish collection of 1755. It was acted several times during the eighteenth century, with Garrick on one occasion as Tancred; but it was based not on Wilmot's play but on *Gil Blas*, Book IV, *Le Mariage de Vengeance*. Other versions are mentioned in Dodsley, vol. II of the 1825 edition, p. 172.

While the whole play was revised and in many respects rewritten by Wilmot when the 1591/2 edition was published, it was (as usual) originally the result of collaboration. The authors were five in number, each producing one act, a device which persisted throughout the Elizabethan period and which resulted in such complicated authorships as that of *Sir Thomas More*. Wilmot scrupulously printed the initials of the authors after the acts. They were: Act I—Rod. Staf(ford); Act II—Hen. No(ël); Act III—G. Al; Act IV—Ch. Hat(ton); Act V—R. W(ilmot). Of these only Hatton is found to have been admitted to the Inner Temple, but probably all were members. Cunliffe (*E.E.C.T.*, p. lxxxvi) suggests that Stafford was the "Master Stafford" who in 1556/7 was fined £5 for refusing to act as Marshal. Noël, according to Chambers (*Elizabethan Stage*, III. 456), was probably Elizabeth's Gentleman Pensioner, who died in 1597; G. Al. has not been identified; Hatton was the Court favourite Sir Christopher Hatton (1540-91), who was admitted to the Inner Temple in 1559/60. We know that R. W. is Wilmot—he signs a prefatory letter with his full name. According to Fleay, *Chronicle of the English Drama*, II. 277, he was a member of the Inner Temple in 1568; but the *Dictionary of National Biography* does not give any source for this, and we can only argue

back from the play to the author. He was presented by Gabriel Poyntz in 1582 to the Rectory of N. Okenham in Essex and later to a vicarage at Horndon-on-the-Hill. He was then described (1585) as M.A. The *Dictionary of National Biography* refers to Hunter's MS. *Chorus Vatum* for another possible work by Wilmot—*Syrophrenisia, or the Canaanitish Woman; conflicts at Horndon on-the-Hill in the County of Essex*, 1598. Webbe, in *A Discourse of English Poetry*, speaks of Wilmot as a poet. He died about 1608.

The date of performance of *Gismond of Salerne*, the acted version of the play, has usually been set at 1567–8, each editor following the last; but Sir Edmund Chambers in *The Elizabethan Stage*, III. 514, discusses the question in some detail. Two points are significant: (a) There is an allusion in *A sonet of the Queenes maydes* in the MS. version to "Grenwich court," which makes it probable that the play was produced there; (b) Wilmot, in the printed version, in his letter to the Gentlemen of the Temple, speaks of "the loue that hath bin these 24. yeres betwixt vs." If we take 1591 as the publication date, 1567 may be indicated as the date of performance. Elizabeth, however, did not visit Greenwich in 1567, but did so at Shrovetide 1566. Chambers therefore fixes on February 24–6, 1566, as the nearest date at which a play was likely to have been given there. This dating depends, however, partly on the interpretation of "the loue that hath bin these 24. yeares betwixt vs." If this refers fancifully to Gismund, Chambers's reasoning holds (though even then one would expect the date of performance to fall within the period of "acquaintance" with Gismund); if it refers to the length of Wilmot's connection with the Temple, then the acting date must fall within the limit. We find the Queen at Greenwich on April 6, 1568 (as Chambers shows from the *Calendar of Letters and State Papers* and the *Record of the Churchwardens of St. Martin's*), and May 6, 1569. April 6, 1568, may thus be the performance date.

Such a drama was probably staged in a fashion more elaborate than that of the professional playhouses. A raised stage was placed at one end of the hall; there was scenery—"magnificent palaces and well-equipped houses," as John Bereblock wrote in a Latin description of an entertainment at Christ Church College before the Court in 1566 (quoted in a translation by W. Y. Durand, in Schelling's *Elizabethan Drama*, I. 108). There was probably "simultaneous scenery" like that of the mediæval stage—*G. of S.*

requires a palace, Gismund's chamber, heaven (for Cupid's descent), and hell (for Megæra's ascent) on the stage at once. David Klein, in an article in *P.M.L.A.*, vol. 33, 1918, considers that a more nearly Shakespearean stage would have been suitable for the second version, had that ever been produced. But the palace, Gismund's chamber (probably equivalent to the usual Elizabethan curtained recess), heaven and hell were still required in this version (though these last could have been served by a "creaking throne" and a trapdoor). In the dumb-show before Act II Lucrece "drawing the curtains," speaks to Gismund and raises her from her bed. This would seem to indicate that Gismund's chamber *was* the recess. The curtains of this are again drawn in the dumb-show before Act IV; and in this, as in that before Act V, characters come "from under the stage."

An especially interesting point arises in connection with the final couplet, which is not in the MS. versions:

Thus end our sorrowes with the setting sun;
Now draw the curtains for our Scène is done.

Now, as Sir Edmund Chambers points out (*Elizabethan Stage*, III. 30), Gismund died on the open stage, not in her chamber, Wilmot having modified the play on revision in this point. Thus the reference cannot be to the curtains of her bedchamber, but to a front curtain which was drawn aside. Wilmot may, of course, have written loosely in a non-staged version (are we to take "setting sun" as indicating an afternoon performance?), or the couplet, as Chambers suggests, may belong to the first version, and have been dropped in the MSS. preserved. (This theory seems to be supported by the rhyme of the tag—Wilmot consistently chopped off rather than added rhymes). Chambers quotes an epigram ascribed to Raleigh (*Life a Play*) which ends "Are but drawne curtaynes whē the play is done" (Donne's *Poems*, ed. Grierson, I. 441 and II. 268).

The plot of *T. and G.* is based on the first tale of the fourth day in Boccaccio's *Decamerone*. Schelling (*Elizabethan Drama*, I. 209) considers that the story came through the version in Painter's *Palace of Pleasure* (No. 39). But Cunliffe in an article in *P.M.L.A.*, vol. 21, 1906, has shown that the authors went direct to the Italian, and made great use of Dolce's *Didone* (1547) as well as of Boccaccio. The *Decamerone* story had been badly treated by Cammelli in his *Filostrato e Panfila*, 1499. The substance of the play—the actual

writing as opposed to the plot—is in many places a patchwork, for which the authors (see Cunliffe, *E.E.C.T.*, notes to *G. of S.*, 314 *et seq.*) drew on the following sources :

- (1) Dolce's *Didone*.
- (2) Seneca—his *Phædra*, *Octavia*, *Œdipus*, *Agamemnon*, *Hercules Furens*, *Thyestes*, *Hercules Œtæus*, and *Hippolytus* are all mined, especially in Acts II and V and in the Megæra section of Act IV.
- (3) Ovid.
- (4) Wilmot added the Œdipean tearing out of his eyes by Tancred, probably from Asinari's play of 1576, according to Thorndike, *Tragedy*, p. 56. The same writer sees an influence of Giraldis's *Orbecche* in the romantic subject-matter.
- (5) Other classical authors are laid under tribute, e.g. Vergil. As Jusserand says (*Le Théâtre en Angleterre*, p. 242): " Dans les drames de cette catégorie, on s'applique avec tant de soin à imiter les anciens que souvent des passages entiers sont traduits sans scrupule, presque mot pour mot."

The printed play opens with a prose " Epistle Dedicatorie " " to the Right Worshipfull and vertuous Ladies, the *L. Marie Peter* and the Lady Anne Graie "; the work is no mere trifle, but a solemn and important " mournfull matter " which " will refresh your wits in a gloomie day." There follows a letter " to his friend R.W." from Wm. Webbe, which shows how the play came to be published ; it urges Wilmot to bring " those wast papers " to the light. The youths who performed it let the " book " out of their hands because they were fertile with new things ; but this " orphan " had always favourers and preservers (does this mean that it circulated in manuscript, like Donne's poems, " that by transcription daintily do go through private chambers " ?).

Wilmot's address to the Gentlemen of the Temple follows. A mention of the " *indecorum* of my calling " probably refers to his publishing a play while in orders. He justifies himself with a reference to Beza and Buchanan. Next comes *A Preface to the Quenes Maidens*—a sonnet *Of Honour*, and *Another of the Same*, the latter commending the moral. A verse and prose argument follow.

The story of the play is that of the father, Tancred, whose widowed daughter, Gismund, carries on a clandestine intrigue, and

to whom he presents her lover's heart, like that of Cabestanh, in a gold cup. She kills herself, and her father in remorse does likewise. There is no suggestion of an incestuous love on Tancred's part; rather he is enraged at the dishonour to his name, the possible loss by her marriage of the comfort of his old age and at her disobedience to his wish that she remain single. (In connection with this, we may note an inconsistency in the line "Thine (*i.e.* Gismund), whom I hope to see an Empresse?", which Tancred speaks to the lover.) Stress is laid as much on uncontrolled passion as on parental harshness.

This plot is developed in *T. and G.* In Act I Cupid, well noted by Thorndike as the evil genius of the play, descends from heaven in symbolical guise, and describes his power and his intention to restore his "ancient renowne" by some great act. He passes into King Tancred's palace, and Gismund enters with "four maidens that are the chorus." She weeps her Lord's death, and she and her maidens sing their "daily rites" to his memory. Tancred, entering, pleads with her to cease grieving, saying

How long wilt thou torment thy father thus?
Who daily dies to face thy needles teares.

Gismund counters him in stichomythia.

Act II opens, after a dumb-show, with a conversation between Gismund and her aunt Lucrece, who acts as confidante. The former reveals that she is sorrowing ("in pensiue dumps dismaid") not only for her late husband but because she feels that her "pleasaunt spring" is passing. She loves "a Prince, an Earle, a Countie in the Court," and asks her aunt to test her father's mind. Lucrece does so, as Tancred is about to leave for a hunting expedition, and is told:

Tell her I am her father, whose estate,
Wealth, honor, life, and all that we possesse,
Whollie relies vpon her presence here.

In wrath he returns to the palace, and Lucrece breaks the news to Gismund. The chorus adds a note of praise to Queen Elizabeth.

In a dumb-show before Act III we see Gismund meeting Guisard, and giving him a cane. Cupid speaks of his triumph, and Lucrece laments Gismund's sad state. Guisard splits the cane, and finds a message telling of a vault beneath Gismund's chamber, where they can meet.

The fourth act opens with a dumb-show, in which Tancred, seated in Gismund's bedroom, sees her "amarously embrace" Guisard. He departs in wrath, and Megæra and the Furies celebrate the triumph. Tancred rages, invoking "that God that guideth all" and "the gods, the authors of this spectacle" with equal facility. He calls Renuchio, the Court Chamberlain, and sends for his daughter, debating whether he should kill her, at the same time ordering the arrest of the unfortunate "Countie Palurine." He blames Gismund when she arrives; she makes no defence save her love, and is ordered to return to her chamber. Guisard too shows calm gallantry in the face of the enraged king.

Before Act v Guisard is seen being haled off to be strangled; Renuchio then enters with "a standing cup of gold, with a bloody hart reeking whot in it." He laments the deed, and describes it in gruesome detail to the tender maidens of the chorus. To Gismund he gives her lover's heart in the cup; she makes an eloquent speech, pours poison into the cup, and drinks the potion, after the chorus, who here take a part in the action, have remonstrated with her in stichomythia, and have hastened to call Tancred. He enters, bewails her sad end, and orders that she should be buried with her lover according to her wishes. He resolves on his own death, charges those around him to put a "Royall Epitaph of loue" over the tomb, and to inter him also in it. He then tears out his eyes, Œdipus-fashion, and kills himself. An Epilogue follows.

At the date of the performance of *G. of S.*, drama and the pageant with which it was intermingled found their home in some three quarters. At the Inns of Court and the Universities elaborate shows and plays were presented to the Queen and her courtiers; sometimes the courtiers themselves took part. A second home was found among the boys of the public schools and the children of the Chapel and St. Paul's. Thirdly, the class of professional actors was beginning to gain a status somewhat above that of a vagabond.

Plays such as *T. and G.* were written and performed by the enthusiastic amateurs of the Inns of Court. Here English classical tragedy made its appearance. *Gorboduc*, the first English regular tragedy and the first in blank verse, was produced by the Inner Temple in 1561; *Jocasta*, from Gray's Inn, followed in 1566. Thus the Inner Temple's production of *G. of S.* was almost, as it were, a reply to that play. Such tragedies as these were imitated from Seneca, even when the subject (as in *Gorboduc* or *G. of S.*)

was non-classical. The tragedies of Seneca were not, in fact, intended to be played; they are over-rhetorical and not a very good model for young men of classical tastes. But they were easily available, and so their characteristics passed into English drama. They and their imitations are marked by rhetorical set speeches, full of allusions to classical mythology and studded with *sententiae* (frequently commonplace); the plots in the Elizabethan versions are derived at first from minor classical or semi-classical legends, and are full of the revenge motif and the shedding of blood. The classical tradition, that horrors—unnatural Thyestes feasts and the like—should not take place on the stage itself, was observed fairly faithfully by the earlier and more academic Elizabethans, but is broken by Seneca himself, and by *T. and G.* In this play, indeed, the choice Œdipean detail of Tancred's tearing out his eyes was added by Wilmot in his version, at a date when such horrors, popularized by the sufferings of old Hieronimo, were the craze of the period.¹ It is surprising that he did not add ghosts,² another ingredient of Senecan tragedy: but Cupid and Megæra "hot from hell" perhaps suffice. The play as a whole follows the usage of the ancients, though not slavishly; and the chorus, while representing an attempt to follow classical practice, is also given by Wilmot a part in the action.

It must be kept in mind when we study this play that, while the printing is almost contemporary with *Romeo and Juliet* or *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, the actual performance took place when Elizabethan tragedy was in its crude infancy. *T. and G.* is, indeed, notable in two ways: it turns for the first time to the Italian novelle as sources; and it is the first tragedy in English of star-crossed love, the first in which passion is the theme and motivates the action. (Though Arthur Brooke in the preface to his *Tragicall History of Romeus and Juliet*, 1562, indicates that he had recently seen that story on the stage, this version is not now extant.) Schelling (vol. 1, *Elizabethan Tragedy*, 209) says "*Gismond of Salerne* . . . may be regarded as the first serious attack of the romantic spirit upon the classical restrictions until then imposed upon English tragedy." He adds, "Declamatory and reminiscent of ancient tragedy as it is, *Gismund* is frankly artistic and was written originally to be acted."

¹ Wilmot was perhaps influenced too by the publication in 1581 of Seneca his *Tenne Tragedies, Translated into Englysh*.

² Though Schelling, *Elizabethan Tragedy*, 1. 553, speaks of "the strictly Senecan ghosts of *T. and G.* and *The Misfortunes of Arthur*." Perhaps the Furies?

Promos and Cassandra, though also more or less romantic in theme, was not intended for acting.

Two questions fall to be discussed: the extent of the various influences and sources; and the changes made "according to the decorum of these daies" when Wilmot revised the play in 1591. Up to the date of *G. of S.*, Italian influence had probably been limited to production and to the dumb-shows in *Gorboduc*. In *G. of S.* the plot is taken from Boccaccio; but unfortunately the authors decided to show the evil power of love, and concentrated on "commending virtue" and "lively deciphering their overthrow that suppress not their unruly affections." Boccaccio had shown a passionate love defying social conventions; the Gentlemen of the Inner Temple alter the lover to the "Countie Palurine," emphasize Gismund's sorrow for her dead husband, and by rearranging material show as much the danger of unruly affections as parental tyranny. In this they derived assistance from Dolce's *Didone*. Act I, in which there was little that could be taken from Boccaccio, borrows freely from Dolce—Cupid is directly carried over from the Italian play. The texture of Acts II and III is rather from Boccaccio and Seneca; but in Act IV Hatton uses Dolce for such things as Megæra. Wilmot is chiefly Senecan in expression. The dumb-shows, too, derive from Italian *intermedii*; but while in *Gorboduc* these had been only allegorically connected with the story, in *T. and G.*, as detailed by Wilmot in the printed version, they are integral to the story and indeed show the advance of the action.

What, then, was original in the work of these five gentlemen? Not the characters at least, for, as Cunliffe points out in an article in *P.M.L.A.*, vol. 21, 1906, only two characters (Lucrece and Claudia—merged in the later play) are not borrowed, and they are conventional. A certain dramatic quality has been lost by one of the changes; Gismund meets her father before her lover's death, and so some tension is missed. The death of Tancred is added, which is perhaps morally satisfying: but we could well spare the horrors which Wilmot introduced. In frequent passages which they wrote for themselves, the authors depend on Senecan models (*e.g.* for the device of *stichomythia*). Yet there is a certain amount of competence in the development, along the English episodical lines; the aim is to present the complete action and not merely its crisis. The writing is on the whole smooth enough; the finished product at least merits recognition.

A second question requires brief discussion. What is the connection between *G. of S.* and *T. and G.*? To a comparison of the two David Klein devoted an article ("According to the Decorum of these Daies") in *P.M.L.A.*, vol. 33, 1918. The two plays are virtually the same in that one is a later version of the other; but they differ in the effect of the popular stage, and in particular in the following points:

(1) Wilmot makes gallant efforts, particularly in his own act, to eliminate the more old-fashioned rhyming quatrains and couplets; he chops off rhyme, rearranges lines, etc.

(2) Lucrece and Claudia—the same in function—are fused.

(3) The dumb-shows are given in full, and we see their connection with the action. There must have been something equivalent to these (and to the songs) in the original version, but nothing is noted in the MSS.

(4) The dramatic technique of the whole is better. Characters enter and leave more naturally (it is perhaps the desire to make the play flow smoothly which leads Wilmot into the error of making Renuchio ask unnecessarily, "Where is the Princesse chamber?" (Klein)). Act v is rewritten in order to make the emotion more real, and the chorus is drawn into the action. Conversation, generally stichomythia, is added, and Gismund is drawn as more human. Some inconsistencies have inevitably crept in.

(5) Tancred's death is added.

The play indeed owes its chief interest to its romantic subject, which it tries to treat with all the weight of classical tragedy. In this it is at least partly successful. Had the authors been content with the simple universal passion crossed by inauspicious stars they would have been more successful still: but they felt that a moral justification was necessary, that they must condemn unbridled passion. In showing man swept by this force, they point the way to *Romeo and Juliet*; but they lacked the poetic ability and confused the simplicity of the story, and so cannot move us as Shakespeare's play does.

THE STYLE AND STRUCTURE OF *BEOWULF*

BY JOAN BLOMFIELD

THE unity of *Beowulf* has long been taken for granted, but the sure construction of the poem has only of late been wholeheartedly affirmed.¹ Discrepancies and weaknesses which have puzzled earlier critics now begin to fall into their rightful places in a scheme of poetic conception with its own values. I do not attempt to probe these underlying values, but rather to indicate how they emerge in the plan and method of the poem. It is unfortunate that *Beowulf* is in many ways unique. Since no other poem of sufficient scope on the full heroic plan has survived, only in *Beowulf* can we follow the crystallization of structural processes in style and observe the features that certain modes of thought produce in each.

The setting out of the material is not in *Beowulf* an evolution, following one main line or connecting thread. Instead, the subject is disposed as a circumscribed field in which the themes are drawn out by a centre of attraction—in this case, the character of the good warrior. Far-flung tales and allusions, apparently scattered material and disconnected events are grouped in a wide sweep around the hero's character. In fact, these *are* his character, and their significance in the poem consists in this particular relation; by comparisons we are shown Beowulf's nature, by searchlights into the past and future we are to sense the magnitude and true import of his achievements. From this periphery he draws his substance and reality. By these means he lives and his destiny impregnates the whole poem. The good warrior is displayed as a being consummated through all phases of his life and in all aspects of his character. The whole progress from adventurous youth to wisdom-weighted old age, many discreet elements—the bear-warrior strength, the knightly courtesy, vanity beside humility, and so on—are comprehended in this static unity. It has often been observed that

¹ Most notably by Professor Tolkien (*Beowulf: the Monsters and the Critics*, British Academy, 1936). His remarks on structure (especially pp. 29-33) contain the substance of almost everything I would wish to say. But this aspect of the poem has in general received so little attention that there seems to be room still for detailed exposition.

there is no development of plot or character. The concluding state of affairs must be implicit in the beginning. With such a plan, a pre-ordained course of events, familiar topics, and stock situations are essential for the achievement of depth and scope. Not by transitions and transformations but by suggestion of the ever-present identity of seed in fruit and fruit in seed does the poet adjust the emotional tension. The reference to the burning of Heorot woven into the description of its first glories, and the forecast of family strife while yet all is well in Hroðgar's court are straightforward instances. More complex is the messenger's announcement of Beowulf's death¹: at great length he recounts the rising to power of the Geats—now to fall a prey to peoples they had overcome; their downfall will be the direct consequence of Beowulf's death—who died in defending them; he *þe us beagas geaf* has gained with his last breath yet more *beagas*,² treasure which is thus his personal perquisite, which in perishing with him on the pyre, shall symbolize the joys now to pass for ever from the Geats.³ This tendency to antithesis, frequently verging on paradox, and the constant play of irony are but stylistic manifestations of those movements of the poet's thought which shape the very stuff of the poem.

Stylistic detail might be expected to give reliable indications of the lines on which the theme is constructed; and it is fortunate that the style of *Beowulf* has attracted a large share of the most discerning criticism. Analysis of style is in this case a justifiable approach to analysis of structure. The general impression that *Beowulf*, lacking clarity and speed, is remarkable rather for depth and vibrancy needs explanation in terms both of style and of structure. These effects are partly due to a method of evocation and cross-reference in which contrast is an important element. Notable examples of description by contrast are the allusions to Sigemund, Heremod, and Offa; and there are constant lesser instances of this method and its corollary, parallelism. As a structural principle, it may be traced in the antiphonal exordium. We hear first of the mighty destiny and wide fame of the Scyldings.⁴ The crescendo of

¹ 2,900–3,075.

² 3,011–14:

þær is maðma hord
gold unrimme grimme gecea(po)d
ond nu æt siðestan sylfes feore
beagas (geboh)te.

³ 3,015–24.

⁴ Contributory themes in the same manner are insinuated: Scyld's rich burial is contrasted with his destitute arrival, and the last state of Heorot with the first.

Scylding power rouses opposing forces of cunning evil ever lurking to reverse the prosperity of mankind; by Grendel's raids the fame of the Scyldings is blasted, the utmost human effort frustrated, the mightiest of rulers made impotent. Beowulf is then introduced in the all-powerful enterprise of untried youth. Here the concentration of the double flow increases: for Beowulf is connected with Hroðgar both by grateful allegiance, because of the favour shown to his father, and by his undertaking the trial of valour where others have failed. Complementing the knowledge that Hroðgar his *hold wine* is in need is Beowulf's desire to crown his exploits by the supreme enterprise of *ðing wið þyrse*. The duty of allegiance emerges in Hroðgar's recapitulation of Beowulf's *æþelu* (457-72), the demands of Beowulf's career in his own account of his setting forth¹ (405-41). Both are presaged in the greeting of Wulfgar (338-9), who recognizes in the bearing of Beowulf the *wlenco* and *higeprymm* which have brought him to Heorot, as contrasted with *wræcsið* (which brought his father). The allusion is oblique—Wulfgar is challenging Beowulf as a stranger—and its application by so much the more pointed. This same alternation is at work throughout the poem. The suspension of the theme—the “balance” of which Professor Tolkien speaks—demands a constant confrontation of similar and dissimilar.

A fundamental element in this balance is the poet's distribution of his material within the orbit of a central idea. The descriptive method of recurrence-with-elaboration distributes epithets and qualifying phrases in this way. The simplest form is piling of varied repetition, of the type: *eorlscipe efnde, ealdre geneðde, mæro fremede* (2,132-3).² More complicated is the type: *þonne heoru bunden, hamere geþruen, sweord swate fah swin ofer helme ecgum dyhtig andweard scireð* (1285-7), or *forðon he ær fela nearo neðende niða gedigde, hildehlemma, syððan he Hroðgares, sigoreadið segc, sele fælsode; ond æt guðe forgrap Grendeles mægum laðan cynnes* (2,349-53).³ Here the amplification of several interdependent ideas is carried through by turns, so that the parts of the sentence are interlocked by a spaced and cumulative reinforcement—a method which reaches its ultimate development in the poetry of

¹ Cf.

*hæbbe ic mæro fela
ongunnen on geogoþe*

and the emphasis on *ana* (425, 431).² See also 50-2; 1,228-9; 1,408-10; 2,421-3; 2,602-4.³ See also 194-8; 1,368-72; 1,417-20; 1,448-54; 2,356-9.

the Norse skalds. And in the last analysis, the "synonyms" so characteristic of Old English poetic diction express in little the multiplicity, the resolution into separate aspects, shown in the presentation of the theme itself.

For the structure of the poem is not sequential, but complementary; at the outset certain parts of a situation are displayed, and these are given coherence and significance by progressive addition of its other parts. Already Klaeber has noticed a circumscribing movement, and in the most penetrating passages of his criticism he constantly recurs to this idea.¹ He recognizes "an organic relation between the rhetorical characteristics and certain narrower linguistic facts as well as the broader stylistic features and peculiarities of the narrative" (p. lxxv), citing in particular "retardation by means of variations and parenthetical utterances" and further elaborating the idea in his statement: "The preponderance of the nominal over the verbal element, one of the outstanding features of the ancient diction, runs parallel to the favourite practice of stating merely the result of an action and of dwelling on a state or situation." Yet having worked out this organic relation and as good as stated the pervading conception imposing form on the whole material out to its fringes of verbal detail, he can suggest no structural unity, but speaks instead of "looseness" and "matter more or less detached from the chief narrative" (pp. liii, lvii).

Klaeber has noted the outstanding instances of a circumambient structure, although the heading under which he groups them—Lack of Steady Advance—again shows that he does not allow the principle its fundamental importance. Most clearly in the fight with Grendel, but also to some extent in the slaying of Grendel's mother and the account of the dragon's hoard, we see the unfolding of an event into its separate aspects. Apparently, the sum of them all—synchronism and the momentary visual impression—is the one aspect not considered poetically significant. The course of the fight in the hall is several times reviewed,² each time in different terms and with varying emphasis. Grendel's movements and motives and his final sense of defeat are first described (745-57). The poet next reverts to Beowulf's grapple, considered as a fulfilment of his *æfenspræc*. In 764-5 the climax, the tearing off of

¹ "Irregular, circuitous movements," p. lxxv; "circuitous route," p. lxxiii; "The thought of this passage, though proceeding by a circuitous route, is not obscure," note on 86-114; Klaeber's *Beowulf*, 3rd edition, 1936.

² Cf. Klaeber, pp. lviii and note on 710 ff.

Grendel's arm, is obscurely stated in a metaphor.¹ The fight is then represented from the point of view of the Danes (765-90) who hear the din raging within their hall; the climax is here marked by the shriek of defeat, which is elaborated at some length (782-88). Lastly, the sensations of the Geats when they see their lord at grips with the monster provide an opportunity for contrasting Grendel's magic immunity from bite of iron with his impotence against the decrees of providence (801-15); these reflections are concluded with an explicit account of the severing of the claw, darkly alluded to before. The outcome for each of the three parties—Beowulf, Grendel, and the Danes—is then summed up, and the severed claw again mentioned, this time as the proof and symbol of Grendel's final defeat. A similar disregard for the synchronizing of the separate aspects of an action is seen in the defeat of Grendel's mother. Throughout the struggle the poet draws out the implications of each stage; he describes the virtues of the magic sword which Beowulf seizes in his desperation (1,557 ff.), occupies seven lines with the brandishing and victorious thrust, and next proceeds to display in one of his rare similes the flash of light which marks the defeat of the sorceress (1,570-2). The beheading of Grendel's corpse is also worthy of note. Much space is given to the retribution implied in this act, and the appearance of the huge headless body is touched upon: only in the final phrase is it stated *ond hine þa heafde becearf*.

We learn of the dragon and his hoard by the same method of distributing essential parts of a situation into distinct groups. The first mention of the dragon

*oð ðæt an ongan
deorcum nihtum draca rician* (2,211)

is followed by the incursion of the thief, which leads on to a description of the hoard as the heritage of a vanished line. By means of the last survivor's speech as he consigned them to the earth, the treasures are shown as emblems of mortal joys stilled by death in the dim past. We hear no more of the history of the hoard until the fight is over, and the Geats have only to look upon the ruin and perform the exequies of their lord. Then another feature is brought into play: the hoard is the direct cause of the deaths of the dragon

¹ In support of this interpretation, cf. other instances of the concrete defined in abstract terms: *fela laf*; *wæteregea*, "the terrible waters"; *fugles wým*, Rid. 27, and the probable double entendre in *feorhlastas*, 846.

and Beowulf by reason of the heavy curse laid upon it. Thus the functions of the hoard, as provoker of strife and as bringer of the inevitable *worulde gedal*, are elaborated in the appropriate contexts: not to mention its subsidiary contributions by way of contrast and symbolism.

To illustrate yet wider distribution of elements cohering in one theme, we may take the knitting together of Danish and Geatish history and the relation between Beowulf's account of the fights at Heorot and the earlier description. In the central portion of the poem, which is dominated by domestic and dynastic affairs and courtly observances, one of the three essential elements in the warrior's character is displayed. He must have violence and strength as of a beast, most fully exemplified in youth when he must win his spurs by marvellous deeds. Wisdom and submission to the decrees of providence again are essential. But equally he must take his place as an aristocrat fit to move among kings. When communal court life first comes into the scene (491-661) it is little more than a scaffolding for Beowulf's adventure with the sea-monsters and his *beot*. Its next appearance (1,008-1,237) is much more substantiated. The affairs of both Danish and Geatish courts are included: allusions to the *facenstafas* between Hroðgar and Hroþulf (1018, 1164), the tale of Hnæf Scyldinga who fell in Freswæle, and also the downfall of Hygelac (1202). Beowulf is very honourably taken into this milieu, and his sphere extending over both courts is delineated. The next episode *pær guman druncon* (1647) is entirely occupied with the glorification of Beowulf; the part he is to play as king of the Geats (1,707-9, 1,845-53) and the function of kingship is defined, by contrast with Heremod and by comparison of the tried wisdom of the elder ruler with the sagacity already apparent in the younger (1,842-3).

Beowulf returns to the Geatish court (1,928). In accordance with the filling and deepening of the courtly scene in this part, a disquisition on the ideal type of high-born lady, shown by contrast with *Þryðo* just as the ideal king is contrasted with Heremod, is attached to the person of Hygd. In Beowulf's subsequent relation of his adventure, the stress on the affairs of the Danish court is accentuated by a full account of the Heaðobard attack merely hinted at in connection with the building of the hall (82 ff.). All this helps to fill out the picture of court life. This strain is concluded in 2,199, where we hear that Beowulf is accorded a position among

the Geatish nobility differing only in degree from that of Hygelac himself. The account of the fights at Heorot depicts the value of these episodes as an approach to an assured position in the knightly hierarchy. The struggles are much toned down. Savage and fantastic elements are attributes of the earlier, more primitive Beowulf: here is no mention of the *leoht unfæger* streaming from Grendel's eyes, nor of the fearful din and the cry, nor of the fens beyond; of the severed claw it is said merely *him sio swidre swaðe weardade*. Flatter, less vivid terms are used: *weard . . . to mudbonan* instead of *synsnædum swealh*; *eatol æfengrom* is a concise but not very picturesque description of Grendel; the phrases *wæs . . . hild onsæge* (2,076), *wæs . . . feorh uðgenge* (2,123), *unc hwile wæs handgemæne* (2,137) could not well be more abstract. Room is found for prosaic and curious detail, such as the name of the warrior Grendel devours and the description of the *glof*, neither given elsewhere. Emphasis is laid on the advancement of Beowulf's career: the princely rewards given (2,101-3, 2,134, 2,142-7), his rôle as emissary of the Geats (2,095-6), and his reliance on his *heafodmaga* Hygelac (2,148-51). The theme is brought out still further by innuendos defining knightly conduct by contrast (2,166-9, 2,177-83), and is finally closed on the dominant of Beowulf by a description of his boorish beginnings (2,183-8)—a fact we learn only when it is introduced to heighten Beowulf's eminence and substantiate the comment that a *tireadig mann* will always make good.

The poetry of this time (like the visual art) reaches a high degree of abstraction and formalism. As far as his medium, a sequence of words, will allow, the poet has detached his theme from the processes of time and space and disregarded the appearances which for practical purposes constitute reality. He is able to evaluate his "action" directly, by exhibiting the parts in their æsthetic and moral relations. Hence the "moralizing" passages should be regarded as an integral part of the subject and are in no sense digressions—indeed, they are inextricably blended with some of the finest poetry in *Beowulf*. Emphasis on the causal relation is not required. The structure is not a progression, and follows no direct line. The writer of *Beowulf* is in fact a true poet; he has created a tragic unity, he sees with the poet's eye which splits and recombines the elements of everyday perceptions. The signs and symbols that he uses are now unfamiliar, representations which need to be interpreted; we should not be

misled into thinking them accidents. The ritual of language and exploitation of its metaphysical aspects which are the most outstanding features of this style have repeatedly won the attention of critics,¹ and provide the best clues to the underlying structural unity.

¹ Cf. Klaeber, pp. lxiii-lxvi.

THE STAGING OF *THE TEMPEST*, III. iii

By JOHN C. ADAMS

"The stage-directions of *The Tempest*," writes Prof. J. Dover Wilson, "possess a beauty and elaborateness without parallel in the canon. They bear the unmistakable impress of the master's hand."¹ Three (out of six) of its notably long directions cluster in Act III, Scene iii, to guide the turning-point and chief spectacle of the play. Evidently these three directions have seemed to scholars entirely explicit, for, beginning with Rowe, all editors save one have reprinted them without a word of explanation. The exception is Dyce, whose brief note ² on the phrase "with a quaint device" apparently illuminated to everyone's satisfaction the last cranny where a mystery might be thought to lurk.

Hitherto no one, so far as I am aware, has either challenged Dyce's note (which happens to be incorrect) or interpreted the spectacle in detail. Yet Shakespeare's own audience saw in this scene, I believe, a far greater spectacle than the untutored modern reader would suppose.

The text of *The Tempest* was set up from the prompt copy with care and skill;³ its stage-directions, therefore, must have been readily intelligible to Shakespeare's colleagues, and should also be intelligible to us, provided that we keep in mind the structure of a Jacobean playhouse and are familiar with the stage-craft of the period. The three directions under discussion are here brought together⁴ and labelled respectively *A*, *B*, and *C*. The first occurs nineteen lines⁵ after the scene had opened with the entrance of Alonso, his

¹ Cambridge New Shakespeare edition of *The Tempest*, p. 80. E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare*, I. 491, substantially concurs: "The stage-directions, especially for the spectacular episodes, are more elaborate than in any other play. They may be, in the main, the author's."

² *Works*, 1866 (the second edition), I. 216, and note 85 on p. 250.

³ The play first appeared in the First Folio; for discussion see Chambers, *loc. cit.*

⁴ All *Tempest* quotations are taken from the First Folio.

⁵ Line numbering follows the Globe edition.

five companions, and others, upon the outer stage,¹ supposedly a glade.

A. Solemne and strange Musicke : and Prosper on the top ² (*invisible* :) ³
Enter seuerall strange shapes, ⁴ *bringing in a Banquet ;* ⁵ *and dance about it*
with gentle actions of salutations, and inuiting the King, &c. to eate, they
depart.

B. (following line 52) Thunder and Lightning. Enter Ariell (like a Harpey)
claps his wings vpon the Table, and with a quient deuice the Banquet vanishes.

C. (following line 82) He [Ariel] vanishes in Thunder : then (to soft
Musicke.) Enter the shapes againe, and daunce (with mockes and mowes)
and carrying out the Table.

I

On reading these three directions as a group one observes that both *B* and *C* specifically mention a table, whereas *A* does not ; it merely directs the Shapes to bring in a banquet. Yet it is evident that the Shapes bring in a table on which the food is laid out, just as later they carry out the table. Following domestic (and therefore stage) custom, the table was covered with a thick fringed cloth, large enough to reach on all four sides almost to the stage floor.⁶

II

One phrase in *B*—"with a quient deuice the Banquet vanishes"—at once attracts attention, for it alone is enigmatic, whereas, to outward appearances at least, all other words and phrases in the three

¹ There can be no question of any part of the scene taking place in the inner stage. The lines, the context, the wording of the stage-directions, the position of Prospero, etc., all point to the outer stage.

² "On the top" is discussed in detail in Part IV.

³ Cf. *The Tempest*, i. ii. 24, and also *Henslowe Papers*, ed. W. W. Greg, p. 123, "A robe for to goo invisibell." For a hint as to the nature of this special costume see the *N.E.D.* under "net" ; or, again, though the hint is rather late, see *The Prelude*, Bk. VII, lines 286-7, wherein Wordsworth, describing an actor he had seen on a stage at Sadlers Well, writes :

"The garb he wears is black as death, the word

'Invisible' flames forth upon his chest."

For this second reference I am indebted to William Strunk, jr.

⁴ Cf. lines 30-33 of this scene.

⁵ In Shakespeare's time a banquet consisted of a slight repast of sweetmeats, fruit, and wine.

⁶ For illustrations of tables and table-covers see the portrait of Prince Henry (circa 1610 ?) by Van Somer, reproduced in *Shakespeare's England*, i., facing p. 110 ; the title-page of the 1630 quarto of *Friar Bacon* ; and the Cavalier cartoon of 1649, reproduced by Hotson, *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage*, facing p. 30, which shows an inner-stage set.

directions seem specific and comprehensible. Just what is the *device* and how does it work?

Dyce believed "that the mechanist of the theatre was to do his best to make it seem that the harpy has devoured the banquet (compare what Prospero says presently,

Bravely the figure of this harpy hast thou
Perform'd, my Ariel; a grace it had, *devouring*, etc.),

and to contrive some method for the disappearing of the table."

Now the first part of Dyce's statement, though providing us with a theory, does not in fact explain how the business was managed. The second part is simply mistaken, for nothing in the stage-directions or in the text justifies his notion that the table disappeared before the Shapes carry it off-stage (in C).

To discover the operating principle of the *quaint device* requires some knowledge of Elizabethan stage-craft. In Shakespeare's time any sudden disappearance of an object from the outer stage normally implies the use of a trap. Exceptions to this rule are almost non-existent—so rare, indeed, that in some five hundred plays of the period they can be counted on the fingers of one hand. Does *The Tempest* follow the rule or is it one of the exceptions?

On turning to another part of *B* with this question in mind one is able to perceive the true significance of the direction "*Ariell . . . claps his wings upon the Table.*"¹ Lifted from its context or studied without reference to parallel situations in other Jacobean plays, this direction might pass muster as a mere dramatic gesture; but in its context, *i.e.* a scene wherein a banquet on the outer stage vanishes from sight—and that, too, immediately after Ariel's clapping on the table—one can hardly escape the conclusion that Ariel's real business is to give a trap-signal.² The signal is, of course, disguised under the semblance of a timely and appropriate action,³ here, obviously, a gesture which suggests to the audience that the harpy has magically "devoured" the banquet.

But even in the theatre magic generally turns out to be leger-

¹ The *N.E.D.* shows that between the time of Shakespeare's boyhood and the present the normal import of each of the words in this direction has remained the same.

² The signal was most commonly given by stamping on the stage floor. For example, in *The Silver Age* (1612), III. iv:

"*Pluto.* Cleaue earth, and when I stampe vpon thy breast
Sinke me, my brasse-shod wagon, and my selfe," etc.

³ For example, a witch raps with her staff, a grave-digger thumps with his spade, and so forth.

demain and can be explained in prosaic terms. While pondering the connection between the trap-signal and the disappearing food we must reject the idea that the outer-stage trap was lowered, bearing with it the table and thus causing the banquet to vanish, for such a solution is neither sufficiently deft nor unusual to justify the inclusion of the word "quaint"¹ in the stage-direction. A *quaint device* suggests a new and ingenious property, specially designed for this scene, and unlike anything normally used in the playhouse. We are in a fair position to guess what the property was like, but a happy chance enables us to proceed by surer means. On tracing the Restoration history of *The Tempest* one comes upon a scene in Shadwell's revision² containing the direction:

A table rises, and four Spirits with wine and meat enter, placing it [i.e. the banquet], as they dance, on the table: the dance ended the bottles vanish, and the table sinks again.

Disregarding the changes in superficial details, let us examine the property table and the *modus operandi* of this later stage-business. Shadwell's table manifestly had in its top a false panel covering a hidden receptacle. When this panel was sprung the bottles vanished inside, after which the panel was returned to its first position. The business would doubtless be managed by some stage-hand who crouched beneath the table as it rose, and was screened from the sight of the audience by the table's overhanging cover.³ In short the false panel was a replica in small of an early type of stage trap, and its operator had, as usual, to be guided by an audible signal. In Shadwell the signal was probably the final beat of the dance and its musical accompaniment.

On returning to Shakespeare's scene we find by the process of elimination that the stage-business (in its essentials) used by Shadwell will meet the requirements of the original. Ariel could not sweep the banquet⁴ into an open receptacle affixed to the rear edge of the table, for those members of the audience who faced the sides of the stage or who looked down from the galleries would inevitably have seen that receptacle. Nor may we suppose that Ariel nimbly

¹ "Quaint" is defined in the *N.E.D.* as "ingenious, clever, cunning—1641."

² *The Tempest, or the Enchanted Island* (1674), IV. ii.

³ Inasmuch as the table rises, it would have been simpler and more assured to have the operator rise also than to have him remain in the cellar and work the mechanism by cords.

⁴ Made of papier-maché?

deposited the banquet inside his costume. With his hands encumbered with wings he would run the risk of dropping some food or dish if working rapidly, or would no less mar the artistic effect of the scene if he proceeded with caution. Moreover, the picture of his costume bulging with the banquet for at least three men is too absurd to contemplate. A more formidable objection, however, lies in the wording of the stage-direction. There it is explicitly recorded that Ariel "*claps his wings upon the Table and with a quient device the Banquet vanishes.*" Warned by this strong implication of a machine, we are not free to suppose that Ariel himself handled the food.

But in addition to concluding that Shakespeare called for a special table we must also conclude that Ariel left the manipulation of the table's false top to a stage-hand hidden under the table¹ (we shall take up presently how the man got there). The wings covering Ariel's arms and hands would make it difficult if not impossible for him to effect the swift release of any trigger or recessed catch small enough to escape notice once the table was cleared of the banquet, to say nothing of the difficulty of returning the panel to position. It would be quite easy, on the other hand, for him to signal to his assistant beneath the table; and this he does, as the stage-direction led us to expect, by clapping his wings upon the table. When we know by what means Ariel reached the table, this point will be even more convincing.²

To determine how the assistant managed to be in place when Ariel gave the signal will not long puzzle us when we recall that Shadwell's table, rising through the trap, was provided with a stage-hand already inside it. Shakespeare's table, carried on-stage by the Shapes, was doubtless similarly provided (the additional weight would be negligible if the assistant were recruited from the ranks of boy actors enrolled in the company), with no one in the audience suspecting the device because of the concealment afforded by the overhanging table-cover and its heavy fringe.

An alternative explanation, just as workable, if at first sight more involved, is worth including here because it provides a substratum of theatrical *raison d'être* for the dances given by the Shapes (one in *A* and another in *C*) and for a passage which, at least in part,³ seems dramatically somewhat attenuated. This second explanation

¹ The cord hypothesis will not work here, for the table was carried on instead of rising, with cords in place, on the trap.

² See below, Part III.

³ Lines 25-39.

assumes that when (in *A*) the Shapes bring in the table¹ they are careful to place it squarely over the trap in the middle of the outer stage.² The overhanging table-cover, extending to the floor, would entirely conceal the opening of the trap to let the stage-hand mount within, just as (in *A*) the "*Solemne and strange Musicke*" and the sound of the Shapes dancing (note that they dance after the table is set in place) would disguise any noise made by the trap mechanism.³ The patter of their feet on the stage floor near the table would, in fact, more effectively drown out the noise of the moving trap than the dance music produced in the upper floors of the tiring-house. If it is thought that the assistant needed time in which to climb up inside the table and make ready for the tripping of the panel, then we have a definite theatrical reason for the thirty-two and one-half lines⁴ which separate *A* and *B*. According to this theory the trap need not have been lowered more than three or four feet, or enough to permit the assistant to stand upright beneath the table. The trap would be left stationary after the assistant had done his work and returned to the cellar, and it would be returned to stage level during the second dance of the Shapes (in *C*).⁵

One final point remains in this analysis of the *quaint device*. Have our discoveries any bearing on Shakespeare's choice of a harpy costume for Ariel? We see at once the classical allusion in the harpy's "devouring" of the food, but is it not also obvious that the choice had a more immediate and practical purpose, namely, that the harpy's wings would hide the only visible trace of the *device* in operation? A harpy costume, reasonably proportioned, would have wings some four feet long and two feet wide. When Ariel "claps his wings vpon the Table" their outstretched expanse would wholly conceal the banquet. But we have learned that this action is

¹ Shadwell's table was, of course, small enough to descend through the trap; for the theory under discussion the table would have to be large enough to straddle the trap opening. But the Globe had both sizes; see, for example, *Henry VIII* (1613), I. iv.

² Four other traps, one in each corner of the outer stage, were available, but because of their obscure and outlying location a centralized spectacle such as this in *The Tempest* would make no use of them.

³ Thunder usually accompanied the use of a trap. For discussion of this point see W. J. Lawrence, *Physical Conditions of the Elizabethan Public Playhouse*, p. 121.

⁴ A. Hart, in "The Time Allotted for the Representation of Elizabethan and Jacobean Plays" (*R.E.S.*, October, 1932), shows that Elizabethan actors normally spoke at the rate of slightly more than twenty lines of blank verse to the minute.

⁵ This second theory is possibly more in line with the conclusions reached in Part III of this paper than the first; but having presented both I shall leave the reader to choose between them for himself.

also the signal for the assistant to whisk the banquet out of sight. An instant later, therefore, Ariel can lift his wings from a barren table. The audience would see that the food had vanished, but it could not see how Ariel had disposed of it. The effect would be magical indeed.

III

The second long stage-direction (*B*) begins: "*Thunder and Lightning. Enter Ariell (like a Harpy).*" How did Ariel "enter"? Several scholars have suspected that Ariel descended *ex machina*, but as the subject has not been discussed in print, a résumé of the evidence may well be included here.

Playhouse design made possible three ways of entering to the outer stage: Ariel could walk in through a tiring-house door, or he could rise through a trap, or he could descend from the "huts" through a trap-door in the stage "heavens" thirty-two feet above the outer stage.¹ The first two of these ways seem to be out of the question once Ariel's nature, his actions elsewhere in the play, and his present disguise as a harpy are considered. But to make certain that Ariel descends, we can turn to *C* and work back. There the direction begins: "*He [Ariel] vanishes in Thunder.*" The call for thunder and the presence in the stage-direction of the quasi-technical term "vanishes" very definitely presupposes the use of stage machinery either for ascent aloft or for descent into the earth. But since the latter is unthinkable, it follows that Ariel ascended into the stage-heavens. But once it is established that he left the stage by ascending (*C*), we are forced to conclude also that he entered² by descending (*B*). Only twenty-nine lines of text separate the two directions, and, as a rule, in any such brief visit to the stage the descent and the ascent (necessarily in this order) are accomplished by one operating cycle of the heavens-trap machinery. The reasons for this are not hard to find. The visible machinery consisted of wires or cords with, usually, some sort of basket or car (disguised as a cloud,³ a throne,⁴ a chariot,⁵ and so forth) suspended thereby.

¹ See below, Part IV.

² The term "enter" not infrequently was used in stage-directions to mean "descend"; see, for example, *The Prophetess*, II. iii, wherein the context and the final "mount up, my birds" show indisputably that the heavens-trap machinery was involved in the initial entrance, which is simply marked "Enter. . . ."

³ *No Wit No Help*, IV. ii.

⁴ *The Prophetess*, II. iii.

⁵ *A Wife for a Month*, III. ii.

When carrying some spectacular creature, such as a god or goddess, prophet or witch, the mechanical details were relatively inconspicuous, and hence the device as a whole was thoroughly acceptable. This we know from its frequent employment not only before the mixed audiences at public playhouses but also before the more critical audiences at Court masques and private playhouses. It is, in fact, the outstanding theatrical device of the lustrum in which *The Tempest* appeared. On the other hand, the descent or ascent of the wires or cords by themselves or with a dangling empty car attached—either of which every eye in the playhouse would follow—was anything but acceptable; for then the mechanism alone was visible and would distract the attention of the audience from the play. *The Tempest*, III. iii, provides no evidence of any attempt to lower a contraption for Ariel's ascent *after* he is once on the stage; nor is that surprising, for the operation of the heavens-trap machine at any point between his arrival and the conclusion of his solemn rebuke would have been intolerably distracting—an example of theatrical bungling hardly to be equalled in the entire range of the Elizabethan drama. In short, Ariel, in order to ascend in *C*, must first descend in *B*.

In another Globe play, written in part by Shakespeare and produced in 1610, the stage-business helps us to determine more exactly the nature of Ariel's descent. In *Cymbeline*, v. iv, a direction reads: "*Jupiter descends in Thunder and Lightning, sitting uppon an Eagle.*" Twenty-one lines later the god rises again to his "Palace Christalline" in the heavens.¹ Now in view of Ariel's descent "like a Harpey" in *The Tempest* a year later, Jupiter's eagle merits attention. It would seem evident that if the Globe property-makers could fabricate a bird sufficiently like an eagle for use in a dignified situation² and sufficiently large for Jupiter to ride upon,³ then they could also fabricate for the smaller Ariel a harpy costume⁴ having a concealed harness for fastening him to the wires of the heavens-trap machine. If this is so—and indeed it seems almost

¹ The display in *The Tempest*, 1611, is similar in so many ways to the display in *Cymbeline*, 1610, that the one doubtless was hatched out of the other.

² The celerity and literalness with which Heywood copied this device in his *Golden Age* (1611), v. iii, shows that Shakespeare's innovation was entirely successful.

³ The eagle is, in other words, simply a variant form of the usual car.

⁴ The harpy of mythology had a woman's head and upper torso, with a bird's wings, tail, legs, and claws. From the direction *B* we know that Ariel's costume had wings, but how closely the other details were followed and whether the costume was basically a rigid shell or was a softer suit with internal harness I do not know.

inescapable—then Ariel needed no car, but could “fly” straight down.¹

It is now apparent that we should discover, if possible, the exact spot on the outer stage toward which Ariel descended. If, in an earlier part of this investigation, we chose to believe that the property table was placed over the main trap of the outer stage and was worked by a stage-hand who rose through the trap, then, because the heavens-trap was directly over the outer-stage trap,² it would follow automatically that Ariel descended directly over the banquet. If, on the other hand, we chose the alternative theory, that of the table carried on-stage with its assistant already concealed inside, then we can only assume that the Shapes placed the table over the trap and in the path of Ariel's descent. In light of the facts already gleaned, however, that assumption carries a good deal of weight. Manifestly the harpy is not so clumsy a bird that, having espied food on a table, he must first alight on the ground nearby before hopping over to devour it. This would violate all tradition. Ariel, moreover, is not one to set foot upon the ground when he can remain in the air, his native element. Nor is this abnormal stage-craft. It was customary for the supernatural beings of other plays—as, for example, *Cymbeline* just quoted—to descend part way and there remain, suspended in mid-air, for the duration of their visit to the Earth. From whatever side one approaches the problem, the conclusion is ever the same, namely, that Ariel descended over the banquet.

While pondering Ariel's flight from above we might at first suppose that he descended feet first; but from what we already know this seems unlikely. The stage-hand waiting underneath the table cannot see what is going on; he cannot be expected, therefore, to disregard the sounds of Ariel's harpy claws as they grope for a foot-

A passage in *Paradise Regained*, Bk. II, lines 401-403, possibly hints at Ariel's claws:

“with that
Both table and provisions vanish'd quite

With sound of Harpies' wings, and talons heard,”

but even granting Milton's fondness for *The Tempest*, the allusion is highly dubious. On the other hand we do have lists of properties and costumes from the days of Elizabethan plays and masques which suggest that Ariel's costume could have been realistic and practical.

¹ Ariel's descent without a car is, so far as I can discover, the first of its kind on the Elizabethan stage. It is soon imitated, however; see, for example, *The Silver Age* (1612), III. iv.

² This relationship of the two traps in the Globe and other playhouses has hitherto escaped notice. Proof, too involved for inclusion here, begins with a clearly set-out episode in the final scene of *The Brazen Age*, produced in 1612 at the Red Bull Playhouse.

hold on the table and to accept as the true signal the later clapping of his wings. Moreover, Ariel would have little chance of controlling the placement of his feet while being lowered on wires which would certainly sway (and perhaps rotate) at least a little. The possibility of an untimely springing of the *device* in the one case and of playing ninepins with the banquet in the other is too great to be risked. Yet these consequences are inevitable if Ariel, descending feet first over the table, is to drop low enough to clap his wings upon it.

What then is the alternative? We are left to conclude (1) that the descent was checked at some rehearsed point a short distance above the table, and (2) that Ariel, flying in a prone or inclined position, reached down with his wings, clapped them on the table, and remained in that position for the second or two required for clearing away the banquet.

After the food had vanished, Ariel was free to take whatever position best served his turn. He could, of course, remain suspended just over the table, but I suggest that after casting his spell upon the sword-arms of his enemies he scornfully flapped his wings and rose a few feet to a more elevated position in mid-air. There, dominating the stage, and with all eyes focused upon him, he could most effectively deliver Prospero's message.

IV

To conclude this study of *The Tempest*, III. iii, let us return to *A* and consider where Prospero stands when he enters "on the top" and why he is there. The first question has received scant attention because it has been generally believed that the tiring-house contained only one gallery; hence "on the top" could only mean in the minds of editors "in the balcony at the back of the stage."¹ But this conclusion, necessarily depending upon what editors supposed to be the playhouse design, is founded upon error, for the tiring-house had in reality two galleries, one over the other.

The error crystallized in 1907, when Mr. W. H. Godfrey, assisted by the late William Archer and Mr. W. J. Lawrence, drew up his well-known reconstruction of the Fortune Playhouse.² In the main

¹ Collier, *Shakespeare's Plays and Poems*, I. 59.

² Reproduced in many works concerned with the Elizabethan drama, for instance, *Shakespeare's England*, II. 306; *A Companion to Shakespeare Studies*, 1934, pp. 24 ff.

he based his conclusions on the details set down in the Fortune contract. But unfortunately the plan of the stage itself, originally attached to that contract, was lost; and for the position, unspecified in the contract, of the stage-cover or "heavens" he relied upon the so-called De Witt sketch of the interior of the Swan Playhouse, a "crude and inexact"¹ drawing made at second hand by Van Burchell after a visit or communication from De Witt. Assuming that the De Witt view intended to show a stage-cover that was, on its under side, level with the ceiling of the second gallery of the playhouse, Mr. Godfrey drew his Fortune plans accordingly.

But of all the conclusions that can be derived from the Swan sketch, those having to do with its "heavens" are most open to question,² for the stage-cover cannot extend over the platform stage where Mr. Godfrey places it without screening from the third spectator-gallery all view of the upper stage and a goodly portion of the much-used inner stage. Further, members of the audience in the sides of the third spectator-gallery could have seen only one-half of the outer stage. Manifestly under such conditions the third spectator-gallery would be impracticable; no one would have used it, much less have paid extra for the right to be there. But since the second level of the tiring-house was used as a stage and not for spectators (as research since 1907 has incontrovertibly shown) and since the third spectator-gallery was in demand from the time of the first Elizabethan playhouse to the last, Mr. Godfrey's assumption about the placing of the stage-cover must be corrected. To do so—to permit a clear view of the entire platform stage and of the balconied upper stage on the second level of the tiring-house, the stage-cover must be not less high than the heads of the highest placed spectator in the third spectator-gallery.

But once it is realized that the stage-cover was coextensive with the ceiling of the third spectator-gallery of the playhouse (where, in fact, pictorial and dramatic evidence as well as practical necessity place it³), then it is obvious that the façade of the third story of the tiring-house—which Mr. Godfrey's plan eliminated—was a wholly

¹ So J. Q. Adams, *Shakespearean Playhouses*, p. 167.

² Cf. J. Q. Adams, "The Four Pictorial Representations of the Elizabethan Stage," in *Journal of English and German Philology*, x, 329.

³ This evidence is too lengthy for inclusion here in full. Until it appears the reader is asked to supplement the handful of arguments hereafter advanced by consulting the reconstructions of the Globe Playhouse made by J. Q. Adams and included in his *Life of William Shakespeare*, 1923, or by the present writer for *Theatre Arts Monthly*, October and November, 1936.

visible part of the scenic wall. Portions of this third-story façade consisted of solid wall, but the middle portion, over the second-floor stage, opened to form a music gallery. From a number of sources it can be shown that this top gallery was guarded by a wooden railing and was faced with diaphanous curtains; behind these curtains the playhouse orchestra performed, except at such times as the "book" called for some special accompaniment elsewhere.

During the reign of King James, when dramatists were taxing the full capacity of their theatres for dramatic effects, this top music gallery was from time to time drawn into use as a stage. *The Tempest*, III. iii, furnishes us, beyond a doubt, with an example of such use, and "*Prospero on the top*" means that Prospero appeared in front of or between the music curtains, facing the audience, and like some god of Olympus surveying mortals on the Earth,¹ looking down upon his enemies on the outer stage.

Let us examine the only other occasion in which Shakespeare employs the phrase technically. *Henry VI*, Part I (1623), III. ii, contains the direction: "*Enter Pucell on the top, thrusting out a Torch burning.*" As soon as the Bastard observes it he exclaims:

See noble *Charles* the Beacon of our friend,
The burning Torch in yonder Turret stands.

After suitable alarums and excursions:

Enter Talbot and Burgonie without [i.e. on the outer stage]: within, Pucell, Charles, Bastard, and Reignier on the walls [i.e. on the "tarras" or balcony in front of the curtains of the upper stage].

Sir Edmund Chambers, in discussing this stage business,² holds that "on the 'top' does not mean the loft from which the theatre's flag waved and its trumpet was blown. Nothing here would come into the action of a play, in view of the intervention of the projecting 'heavens.' The 'top' must have been over the stage balcony, on a level with the upper row of galleries, as the balcony itself was on a level with the middle row." Just so. The "top" in *Henry VI*, Part I, was the same top music balcony on which Prospero appears, emerging, like La Pucelle, between the music curtains and standing forward against the railing some twenty-five feet above the outer platform stage.

¹ A use to which the top balcony was put in other plays, e.g. *The Silver Age*, III, and *Four Plays in One*, IV.

² *William Shakespeare* (1930), I. 293.

Since we now know where Prospero stands, let us enter a wholly unexplored territory and consider why he is there. One reason, of course, is obvious: Prospero appears "on the top" to witness the confusion of his enemies. After this is done he suitably praises Ariel and his "meaner ministers" for their work, declares his intention of visiting Ferdinand and Miranda, and makes his exit from above. All this is thoroughly appropriate.

But if Prospero's long silence and the eleven lines he speaks thereafter are scrutinized in the light of dramatic necessity, they are found to be somewhat negligible. In view of his magic powers he need not be present at the scene in order to know its result (elsewhere he is content to delegate power to Ariel and to be told the result). His words add little or nothing to our grasp of the situation: the praise of Ariel and his helpers, in what amounts to an aside, is dramatically superfluous, for we need no urging to admit the skill with which Ariel has routed the "men of sin." The proposed visit to Ferdinand and Miranda is merely an exit line. But even granting wholeheartedly the dramatic appropriateness of Prospero's presence, let us see if there is not some more compelling theatrical reason underlying his entrance to the music gallery just in time to witness this highly involved spectacle.

It is generally known that a well-defined system of signals was used in the Elizabethan theatre to govern the operation of traps. Attention has not been called, however, to a method of signalling to the musicians in the music gallery. Several episodes and directions in the texts of the period point to the existence of such a system.¹ One episode in particular shows us the system in some detail. In Act II, scene i, of *The Roman Actor*, Cæsar, on the outer stage, sends Aretinus into the palace with a message to Domitia (see line 171):

And say I do entreate (for she rules him
Whom all men else obey) she would vouchsafe
The musicke of her voice, at yonder window,
When I aduance my hand thus.

Exit Aretinus

¹ For example, see *The Faery Pastoral*, v. v.: "Musick to the song her[e] knock't up." Again, *Epicæne*, iv. ii, at line 12: "Otter. Gentlemen, I have plac'd the drum and the trumpets, and one to give 'hem the signe when you are ready." Then at line 69 he adds, "Sound Tritons of the Thames." Whereupon follows the direction, "Morose speaks from above; the trumpets sounding." And again, *The Cruelty of the Spaniards in Peru*, 1.: "The Chief Priest of Peru wav'd his verge towards the Room where the Musick are plac'd behind a Curtain."

Later (line 214 ff.), to torture Domitia's husband, Cæsar continues :

I sing her praise ?
 'Tis farre from my ambition to hope it. *Musicke above*
 It being a debt she onely can lay downe, *and a song.*
 And no tongue else discharge. Harke. I thinke promp[t]ed
 With my consent that you once more should heare her,
 She does begin. An vniuersall silence
 Dwell on this place. 'Tis death with lingring torments
 To all that dare disturbe her. Who can heare this *The song*
 And falls not downe and worships ? in my fancie, *ended*
 Apollo being iudge on *Latinos* hill, *Cæsar goe[s] on.*
 Faire hayr'd *Calliope* on her iuorie Lute, etc.

The scene is printed in this manner in the only seventeenth-century quarto of the play.¹ It is obvious that the directions in the quarto are crowded out of their proper place by the full lines and are placed as near as may be in the spaces left by the shorter lines. Accordingly, all modern editions, following Gifford, print the scene (lines 214-222) as follows :

Domitia appears at the window

Cæsar. I sing her praise ?

'Tis far from my ambition to hope it ;
 It being a debt she only can lay down,
 And no tongue else discharge.

[He raises his hand. Music above.]

Hark ! I think, prompted

With my consent that you once more should hear her,
 She does begin. An universal silence
 Dwell on this place. 'Tis death with lingering torments,
 To all that dare disturb her.—

[A song by Domitia.]

Who can hear this

And falls not down and worships ? etc.

Try as one may, one cannot reject any one of these modernized stage-directions nor dispute their placement in the text. This being the case, *The Roman Actor* shows us clearly how a song in the window stage (on the second level of the tiring-house) and its unseen accompaniment by the playhouse orchestra in the music gallery (on the third level) was co-ordinated by a signal from an actor on the outer

¹ Printed in 1629.

stage. No other interpretation, I believe, takes all the given factors of this episode and the design of the stage into account.¹

We are not to suppose that a special system of signals was invoked for every occasion when the orchestra played in their music gallery,² but it does appear that certain complicated scenes made advisable some special provision for co-ordinating action on the outer stage or elsewhere with stage effects originating far above the platform.

With this insight into theatrical subterfuge we can more nearly comprehend the purpose underlying Prospero's appearance "on the top." Standing in front of or between the music-gallery curtains he is in a far better position than the official playhouse prompter to give, unobserved by the audience, the necessary signals to the musicians and thundermakers placed invisibly behind him. These signals are many, and they must be nicely timed. They call (1) for "*Solemn and strange Musicke*" (A), which announces the presence of supernatural beings, which continues while the Shapes bring in the table and dance about it, and which ceases when they retire; (2) for "*Thunder*" (B), which signals for the stage-hands above to open the heavens-trap and lower Ariel "like a Harpey" to the table, and which ceases abruptly as the banquet vanishes; (3) for "*Thunder*" (C), which prompts the lifting of Ariel; and, subsequent to his disappearing through the heavens-trap, (4) for "*soft Musicke*" (C), which signals the reappearance of the Shapes, continues while they dance and then carry out the table, and promptly ends at their exeunt.

These four separate signals follow a more logical and routine pattern than may at first glance appear. Two of them, the music signals, are designed as cues for the prompter who stands behind the scenic wall two floors below. The other two, the thunder signals, are designed as cues for the stage-hands inside the huts immediately overhead. These unmistakably dissimilar pairs of cues, originating

¹ The placing of the musicians in the third story music gallery is inescapable here once the other positions they sometimes used are considered. Had they been behind the curtains of the upper stage (on the second level) they could not have seen Cæsar's signal; nor would his signal have been necessary, for Domitia, in the adjoining window stage and therefore visible to them, could have given the signal herself. Had they been in the opposite window stage they could have watched both Cæsar and Domitia and would have needed no special signal. Moreover, their visible activity would have made Cæsar's command for silence nonsensical. Had they been in the curtained "study" behind the outer stage they could not have seen Cæsar and the prompter would have had to signal to them; but he, in turn, needed no special signal from Cæsar.

² Yet see *The Tempest*, v. i. 51 ff.

in the music gallery and spread by the sounding-board effect of the stage-cover, would penetrate to every corner of the playhouse. Each time the music sounds (throughout *A* and during the second part of *C*) the prompter knows that he must send the Shapes on-stage for their round of duties. Each time the thunder sounds (throughout *B* and during the first part of *C*) the stage-hands above know that they must attend to Ariel, lowering him the first time and raising him the second. Both sets of signals—music for the dancing and thunder for the trap-work—are strictly in accord with normal Elizabethan stage usage.

Prospero's lofty position on the fore-edge of the music gallery, which includes him in the scene without making him a part of it, is the only position in the playhouse which combines the advantages first of being able to see and hear without impediment all that takes place on the platform stage below and secondly of being in proximity to the source of the music and thunder cues. Prospero can follow every move and syllable below and, by some prearranged signal, can transmit orders to the concealed musicians immediately behind him, thereby evoking the appropriate sound-cues without a second's delay. No such exact timing would be possible if the signals had to come by some relaying device from the prompter two floors below.

I believe, in short, that Shakespeare placed Prospero "on the top" partly to witness the confounding of his enemies but primarily to co-ordinate the highly intricate stage-business which marks the turning-point and is the chief spectacle of *The Tempest*.

FRANCIS MERCURY VAN HELMONT: A NEGLECTED SEVENTEENTH - CENTURY CONTRIBUTION TO THE SCIENCE OF LANGUAGE

By GRACE B. SHERRER

AMONG the many schemes centering about language which were promulgated during the middle decades of the sixteen-hundreds there is an amazing amount of sound scientific observation which has lain neglected these three centuries because of its inclusion in material which has been discarded by men trained exclusively in the modern science. New methods of teaching children to write "swiftly and in real characters,"¹ systems of shorthand,² the sign language for deafmutes,³ a method for teaching deafmutes to speak intelligibly, and, most Utopian of all, the creation of an artificial, universal language by which the minds of men of all nations might freely meet—these were the schemes to which some of England's good minds were devoted in the seventeenth century.

The emphasis placed by the Royal Society upon the necessity of clear, simple language for the reporting of scientific discoveries, the growing demand for literacy among the middle classes, and the general daring hopefulness of the time contributed their forces to speculative and experimental activities centred in language.

From the seventeenth century until the middle of the nineteenth, whoever speculated and experimented with language was certain to regard the subject as Sancho Panza did: "reading and writing come by Nature, but speech is the gift of God." Even the invention of the alphabet, patently a human accomplishment, was characterized so recently as 1880 as "the greatest invention *which the beneficent Creator has allowed to be wrought out by man.*"⁴ The student of

¹ William Petty, *Advice of W. P. to Mr. Samuel Hartlib for the Advancement of Some Particular Parts of Learning*, London, 1648.

² That of Samuel Pepys is perhaps most widely known.

³ Lord Monboddo attributes this invention to Dr. John Wallison, one of the first members of the Royal Society.

⁴ Robert Medham Cust, *Linguistic and Oriental Essays*, London, 1880.

linguistics, because he finds early discussions of language frequently obscured by grotesque and primitive religious terminology, is likely to discard everything written earlier than the beginning of the twentieth century.

However, the student should not discard the linguistic discussion of seventeenth-century thinkers *in toto*. It is the purpose of this paper to direct the attention of students to a contribution to the philosophy of language contained in a book published in Germany in 1667 which carries intermingled with its religious concepts concerning the origin of language some extremely sound observations on phonetics and a practicable method of teaching deafmutes to speak. Since the theories of phonetics contained in the book were discussed by such men as Samuel Hartlib, John Worthington, and Henry More,¹ and since they were favourably commented upon by Increase Mather,² the neglect of the book by the readers and followers of those men must be attributed to the fact that the work was not available in English translation.

The author, Francis Mercury Van Helmont, was the son of the eminent Belgian physician and scientist Jan Baptiste Van Helmont. The father, because he recognized the futility of his own formal education, permitted his son great intellectual freedom. The young man read philosophy and medicine; he observed and experimented; he travelled and practised medicine, building a reputation as physician and diplomat which was to bring him a commission which called him to England for a sojourn of nine years.³

The Inquisition, wishing to pry from him some of the secrets of his remarkable abilities, arrested Van Helmont in 1661 at the court of the Elector of the Palatinate, and carried him to Milan and Rome, where he remained for eighteen months a prisoner. Between periods of questioning by the ecclesiastical court and trips to the torture chamber, where his captors sought to frighten him by exhibiting prisoners undergoing the pains of the rack,⁴ Van Helmont thought out and set down in rough draft his thoughts and observations on

¹ See *The Diary and Correspondence of Dr. John Worthington*, Chetham Society, London, 1855, for the comments of Hartlib and Worthington. Henry More's discussion is scattered through the *Conway Letters*, ed. Marjorie Nicholson, Yale University Press, 1930.

² Increase Mather, *Divine Providences*, Boston, 1684, p. 212.

³ All documentation for facts and dates connected with the life and writings of Van Helmont is contained in the author's dissertation *Francis Mercury Van Helmont, His Personality and Influence*, 1937.

⁴ Francis Mercury Van Helmont, *The Spirit of Diseases*, London, 1694, p. 64.

language. Returning to Heidelberg upon his release from Rome, he was offered by Christian August, elector of the Upper Palatinate, a post in his privy council; the position was accepted, and for eight years Van Helmont was known as Fürstlicher Rath zu Sulzbach.

From the press of Abraham Lichtenwalter at Sulzbach in 1667 were issued Van Helmont's German translation of Boethius and his far more important work on language. The latter was printed in Latin and German versions under the titles *Alphabeti vere naturalis brevissima Delineatio* and *Kurtzer Entwurff des Eigentlichen Natur Alphabets der Heiligen Sprache, nach dessen Anleitung man auch Taugebohrne verstehen und reden machen kan.*¹

The book is dedicated to Christian August, Count Palatine, described by Van Helmont as "meinen gnadigsten Fürsten und Herrn." The frontispiece, identical in the Latin and German versions, is one of more than passing interest. The artist has drawn a man seated before a table on which a mirror and a lighted candle rest. In his left hand is a pair of calipers, with which he measures his lip openings as they are reflected in the mirror. With his right hand he writes his observations upon a scroll.

That the figure is more than a conventional one representing a scientist there can be no doubt. The artist certainly drew Van Helmont from the life, for the style of the beard, the arrangement of the hair, and the piercing darkness of the eyes are characteristic features which appear in the portrait of Van Helmont which Lely painted some years later in England.²

At the end of the text are thirty-six plates carrying sketches of the human head with the mouth and throat exposed in dissection to show the position of the organs in the formation of various sounds. Below the heads are Hebrew characters drawn in enlarged diagrammatic form so that the fancied resemblance between the characters and the organs of speech in their various positions may be readily apprehended by the reader.

In this book Van Helmont set himself to two tasks: to show how the deaf may be taught to speak and to prove that the Hebrew

¹ Contemporary references abbreviate the titles to *Alphabetum Naturæ* and *Die Heilige Sprache*.

² A Dutch version of *Alphabetum Naturæ*, printed by Pieter Rotterdam in 1679, carries a frontispiece depicting Van Helmont, elaborately and elegantly dressed, in the attitude shown in the earlier drawing, but apparently teaching his method to a youth, who stands beside his table. The details of this frontispiece would indicate that during the twelve years since the earlier printing, Van Helmont's theories had commanded the attention of noble followers.

speech is a "holy language" because the characters of its alphabet are veritable diagrams illustrating the position of the lips and tongue in uttering the sounds which were first taught to mankind by the Father of Light.

It is evident that the first of Van Helmont's objectives was attained; his method for teaching mutes to speak contained the basic principles upon which later teaching was accomplished. His secondary objective, to prove the holy origin of the Hebrew tongue, is, of course, fantastic. The amazing aspect of his discussion of the "holy language" is his sound observation of the mechanics of voice production and control; students who discard the religious fantasy will do well to note the discussion of phonics.

The book is organized in three sets of dialogues: the first, a preparation for the discussion of the subject; the second, an explanation of the Alphabet of Nature; and the third, a conclusion about the "holy language." The synopsis of the first section of the book will indicate the nature of Van Helmont's material and approach:

Dialogue I, dealing with the motion and the variation of the human mouth and how a deafmute may understand and apprehend what the speaker utters.

1. A deafmute is not without motion of the tongue, and why he is called dumb.
2. He may learn to understand others from the motion of the mouth and the tongue.
3. One follows this method as one teaches another to read.
4. It is accomplished better in the East than in the North.
5. How one can teach such people to speak.
6. How a mute was brought to a state in which he was able to understand everything.¹

The dialogues are put in the mouths of H. and M., the latter speaking for the author and explaining, sometimes at great length, the ideas which Van Helmont held in regard to speech. The third dialogue is of special interest for the accurate description of the organs of speech, accurate for a time when popular belief named the tongue as the only essential organ. Van Helmont anatomizes the tongue, the valves, the air tubes, the food tube, the design of the breath passages, the uvula, the palate in its various parts, and sets down several rules about the "motion of the tongue."

¹ Francis Mercury Van Helmont, *Alphabeti vere naturalis brevissima Delineatio*, Sulzbach, 1667. The synopsis is contained, with other introductory material, in forty unnumbered pages preceding the text.

Van Helmont recognized the "primary individual requisite of speech," the breath, as a mysterious force intimately connected with life itself. In the fourth dialogue he describes how the air is drawn into the lungs, from which it penetrates toward the stomach and the navel, "the center of the whole being." He describes the route followed as part of the air is forced from the stomach by a "secret circulation" through the whole body while part turns back to the lungs for exhalation and for the production of the voice.

Van Helmont's knowledge of anatomy is complicated by his strange confusion of respiration with the circulation of the blood, but many of the inferences he draws from the facts at his command are correct in the light of later research and discovery. His explanation of the function of the lungs rests upon observation; the record of his observation of physical conditions is expressed in terms of spiritual analogies:

The air which has its ordinary ingress through the nostrils carries together the odor of the mucus or the seed of the brain slowly through the air tubes with itself and therefore must go through the divinely appointed way, namely the lungs, which are made of such noble matter that the air becomes ennobled as it goes through and becomes united with the limbs. And indeed it is so arranged that when any unwholesomeness is drawn in with the air, it will remain (in the lungs) and soon be driven back again by a cough.¹

Erroneous as Van Helmont's knowledge of the respiratory system may have been, he was holding the scientific attitude when he insisted that speech was a complex reaction, conditioned by many diverse factors. Except for the very evident emphasis on spiritual aspects of physical conditions, Van Helmont's study of the mechanics of speech is entirely modern. His understanding of the four sections of the tongue, his conception of the relation of the variation of the oral opening, as controlled by position of the teeth, tongue, and lips, to the quality of sound uttered are those currently accepted by contemporary writers on phonetics.²

Van Helmont's discussion of the process by which a deafmute may be taught to speak may be said to be the earliest exposition of the technique which is now in general use. But for their awkward style, his comments might have been written in our own century:

¹ Francis Mercury Van Helmont, *Alphabeti vere naturalis brevissima Delineatio*, Sulzbach, 1667, p. 25.

² John Samuel Kenyon, *American Pronunciation*, 60 ff.

H. One cannot do better than to place before himself a deafmute from whom he may learn

- (1) that such a man for the most part is only deaf, but with his mouth can make many obscure sounds which he cannot bring into the order of speech. One in whom the hearing is defective may learn from others how he should move his tongue and control his mouth in order to form in a regular way that by way of which he may be understood; that because of that he is also called dumb.
- (2) that such a deaf man has, in general, a quick perceptive eye in such a manner that he understands the spirit and meaning of the word which one presents to him which he can easily read and understand and that alone through the appearance of the motion of our mouths.

M. How may men learn such things then, little by little?

H. In no other but the same manner and method after which an illiterate man learns to read other writing. Such a person uses at first rough clear characters or letters, and when he has learned them well, he goes on to smaller ones and at last to quickly written, crabbed, abbreviated writing, and in time he reads everything that comes to his attention even though he often distorts many of the words. But even so, deaf people pay attention to people who cry and shout loudly . . . they industriously notice how such people move the tongue, lips, face, chin, throat, and neck, which strong motions resemble their rough script as if they were the large letters of the alphabet.

Later, however, when they are accustomed to it, they read the gentle and quick motion of a speaker whom they have learned to understand, when something is spoken out perfectly to their understanding, and all this is accomplished by practice.

But one must begin all this in the eastern lands where the people on account of the heat and because they are in want of much air, speak out heartily with open throat and wide open mouth, so that all the movements of the tongue may be clearly seen. On the contrary in the northern lands, especially in England, the lips scarcely move and the mouth is opened very little.¹

To one who might question the possibility of learning to speak by studying diagrams Van Helmont answers:

It is possible that one can learn how to place the feet from well-designed pictures of the art of dancing; if one wishes to learn fan-swinging, piquet-playing, food-carving, and similar arts, he must examine and follow in the same way; why should not the movements of the tongue be set forth in a similar way and learned?²

¹ Francis Mercury Van Helmont, *Alphabetum Naturæ*, pp. 1-3.

² *Ibid.*, p. 4.

The section of the book which endeavours to establish the Hebrew language as a divinely ordained and revealed tongue is neither so original nor so scientific as the study of the mechanics of speech. Van Helmont did not pretend to have "discovered" the holy origin of the Hebrew alphabet. The Hebrew characters had long been regarded by ancient writers as mystical signs given to mankind by the Deity. Wandering traditions concerning the mysteries carried by the alphabetical symbols were collected by Rabbi Akiba, collated and methodized into an allegorical explanation of the significance of each character, and published late in the fourteenth century.¹

The veneration of the Jews for the letters of the alphabet led writers in both Talmuds to state the doctrine that heaven and earth were created by a mysterious combination of letters,² and Saint Agobardi, investigating the nature of Jewish superstitions, recorded at once his horror of the Jewish grossness in the conception of the Deity and his interest in the belief that

the letters of their alphabet have existed from everlasting, and before the beginning of the world, received diverse offices, in virtue of which they should preside over created things.³

But for Van Helmont's express statement that he thought out the plan of the *Alphabetum Naturæ* during the days of his incarceration at Rome (1661-1663), we should be inclined to attribute to Agobardi's book the credit for setting him to work on the subject. Agobardi, who became bishop of Lyons in 813, had investigated Jewish writings for the purpose of strengthening the Christian position; he wrote against trial by fire and combat and derided the prevalent practice of saint worship. His MS. was lost for eight centuries, and upon its discovery at Lyons in 1667 was published. It is possible that this book may have come into the hands of Knorr von Rosenroth, the great Orientalist and Van Helmont's friend and correspondent, whose conversations may have given Van Helmont an interest in the subject which he carried to his Roman prison with him. At least it is safe to assume that publication of Agobardi's

¹ Akiba, Ben Joseph, *Alphabeti et Commentarius Prolixus*, Venice, 1546, and Cracovia, 1597. Rabbi Akiba is the subject of a recent study: L. Finkelstein, *Akiba, Scholar, Saint, and Martyr*, New York, Covici Friede, 1936.

² Arthur Edward Waite, *The Doctrine and Literature of the Kabbalah*, p. 93.

³ S. Agobardi, Lugudunensis Episcopi, *Opera Omnia*, ed. J. P. Migne, Paris, p. 78.

book assured Van Helmont that his book would be likely to find eager readers.

The year in which Van Helmont's book was published saw also the culmination of England's interest in schemes for a universal language. This culmination of interest centred about the publication of *An Essay Towards a Real Character and a Philosophical Language* by Dr. John Wilkins of London. Dr. Wilkins had gathered an immense amount of material, which he organized into unit concepts, classified according to the ancient theory of correspondences, which might be used as counters in expression. The book commanded the attention of its author's contemporaries; its effect on later students was to bring to discredit the whole of linguistic speculation and research of the seventeenth century.

Van Helmont's book, neglected by English scholars of recent generations, may well be advanced as proof that seventeenth-century thought concerning language contained, overlaid and sometimes obscured by fantastic religious concepts, the germinal ideas for the modern conception of the phenomena of speech.

"CHRISTOPHER NORTH" ON TENNYSON

By ALAN LANG STROUT

THE casual reader in English literature knows John Wilson, "Christopher North", because young Alfred Tennyson lost his temper. Yet the lines on "crusty, rusty, musty, fusty" Christopher are as absurdly inapplicable to the author of the *Recreations of Christopher North* and the best of the *Noctes Ambrosianæ* as they are to John Wilson the sentimental or macabre poet, John Wilson the emotional critic, John Wilson the brilliant talker of "Modern Athens," lecturer in Moral Philosophy for thirty years at the University of Edinburgh, contributor of thousands of pages to *Blackwood's Magazine*, enemy of Whigs, flayer of "Cockneys," and friend of De Quincey, Wordsworth, Lockhart, Walter Scott, Thomas Campbell, and James Hogg. Alexander Smith, in *A Summer in Skye* (1865), writes :

It may be said that Burns, Scott, and Carlyle are the only men really great in literature,—taking *great* in a European sense,—who, during the last eighty years, have been connected with Edinburgh. I do not include Wilson in the list ; for although he was splendid as any of these for the moment, he was evanescent as a Northern light. In the whole man there was something spectacular.

Wilson in his writings is not "great" perhaps. A literary autopsy of his novels and poems is no longer necessary—though it may be worth noting, from Prince D. S. Mirsky's *Pushkin*, that *The Feast during the Plague*, one of the Russian's *Little Tragedies*, "is merely a translation of a scene from Wilson's play" [*The City of the Plague*]. But a man who, if not great, has the fortune to be spectacular, may affect interestingly his age. John Wilson is important as a personality : as a rhapsodist who thrilled hundreds from the lecture platform and thousands from the printed pages of *Maga*, and who, in particular, delighted his generation with the Brobdingnagian humour of the *Noctes Ambrosianæ*, most popular of serials before *Pickwick Papers*. If the early nineteenth century turned to Scott in

the novel and to Byron in poetry, it turned to "Christopher North" in magazine writing.

In the present paper will be discussed Wilson's criticism of Tennyson, a subject which has previously been considered in detail in two chapters of Professor Lounsbury's *The Life and Times of Tennyson*, 1915. In Chapter 8 Lounsbury admirably analyses Wilson's critique of 1832, with more than ordinary fairness to the reviewer; but in Chapter 18, writing with the preconceived theory that Wilson spent his later years "attacking" the poet because of the latter's skit on "crusty Christopher," Lounsbury gives an exceedingly misleading impression of the later relations between poet and critic—an impression which has unfortunately persisted because later scholars have blindly followed this, the only extensive discussion of the subject. In order to make the whole matter clear I feel that a brief recital of the pertinent evidence is desirable, even to the extent of citing much of the material that Lounsbury has also cited. The first part of this paper, then, presents Wilson's criticism of Tennyson; the second part shows how erroneous is Lounsbury's interpretation of much of this criticism.

I

On October 4, 1830, Hallam wrote Tennyson:

I cannot make out that you have been reviewed anywhere, but I have seen no magazines, and a letter from Garden, also of very old date, gives hope of *Blackwood*.¹

Sixteen months later appeared, indeed, the first reference in *Maga* to Tennyson—in the *Noctes Ambrosianæ* of February 1832:

North. All the great schools seem effete . . . Scott, Wordsworth, Southey, Coleridge—all the sacred band—have done their best—their all—but on the horizon I can see not the far-off coming light of the foreheads of a new generation of poets. That dawn will rise over our grave—perhaps not till the forlorn "hic jacet" on our tombstones is in green obliteration. The era has been glorious—that includes Cowper and Wordsworth, Burns and Byron. From what region of man's spirit shall break a new day-spring of song? . . . The future is all darkness.

Tickler. . . . Are there no youngers?

North. A few—but equivocal. I have good hopes of Alfred Tennyson. But the Cockneys are doing what they may to spoil him—and

¹ Hallam Tennyson, *Alfred Lord Tennyson, A Memoir by his Son* (1897), I. 70.

if he suffers them to put their birdlime on his feet, he will stick all the days of his life on hedgerows, or leap fluttering about the bushes. I should be sorry for it—for though his wings are far from being full-fledged, they promise now well in the pinions—and I should not be surprised to see him yet a sky-soarer. His "Golden Days of good Haroun Alraschid" are extremely beautiful. There is feeling—and fancy—in his Oriana. He has a fine ear for melody and harmony too—and rare and rich glimpses of imagination. He has—*genius*.

Tickler. Affectations.

North. Too many. But I admire Alfred—and hope—nay trust—that one day he will prove himself a poet. If he do not—then am I no prophet.

Wilson's famous (or notorious) review of "Poems, chiefly Lyrical," in *Maga* of May 1832, is simply an expansion of this passage in the *Noctes*. "England ought to be producing some young poets now, that there may be no dull interregnum when the old shall have passed away," he writes in his introductory remarks. In the uncomplimentary first half of the article he attacks the eulogists of Tennyson rather than Tennyson himself.

One of the saddest misfortunes that can befall a young poet, is to be the Pet of a Coterie; and the very saddest of all, if in Cockneydom. Such has been the unhappy lot of Alfred Tennyson. He has been elevated to the throne of Little Britain. . . .

The *Englishman's Magazine* ought not to have died [the next paragraph continues]; for it threatened to be a very pleasant periodical. An Essay "on the Genius of Alfred Tennyson" sent it to the grave. The super-human—nay, supernatural—pomposity of that one paper, incapacitated the whole work for living one day longer in this unceremonious world.

But not upon Hallam in the *Englishman's Magazine* of August 1831¹ does Wilson pour out his derision, but upon "the crazy charlatan," "the quack" writing "like the Son of a Syringe," "the Tailor's Trump," the "jewel of a Snip," "Parsnip Junior," who has praised the poems in the *Westminster Review* [of January 1831]. His

¹ See Miss Katherine Burton's *Hallam's Review of Tennyson in Modern Language Notes*, April, 1930, 45, 224-5.

(Miss Burton might note that Wilson does not apply the acidulous "drivel, more dismal drivel, and yet more dismal drivel" to Tennyson's *work*, but to the poems which he considers weakest. Inasmuch as Wilson merely mentions the *Englishman's Magazine* in passing and concentrates his spleen upon the *Westminster* as shown above, I cannot see how this article "could by any clever manipulator be interpreted as a reaction resulting entirely from the well-meaning, but misguided efforts of Tennyson's friend [Hallam]"—provided that the clever manipulator had read Wilson's article with any attention. The Tory autocrat of *Maga* would naturally attack the radical *Westminster* rather than a callow bantling such as the *Englishman's*.)

comments on this victim (John Bowring) show that Christopher North has lost nothing of the vigour of his palmiest days.

When a man of forty-seven writes in the character of a man of seventy he runs the risk of appearing patronizing. Yet the "gentle chastisement" of "Alfred's" "affectations" in the first half of the review is more than atoned for by the ungrudging praise of "Mr. Tennyson's" "fine faculties" in the second half. Wilson's kindly intention clearly appears in one of the concluding paragraphs:

Perhaps, in the first part of our article, we may have exaggerated Mr. Tennyson's not unfrequent silliness, for we are apt to be carried away by the whim of the moment, and in our humorous moods, many things wear a queer look to our aged eyes, which fill young pupils with tears; but we feel assured that in the second part we have not exaggerated his strength—that we have done no more than justice to his fine faculties—and that the millions who delight in *Maga* will, with one voice, confirm our judgment—that Alfred Tennyson is a poet.

So far from being, as Lounsbury asserts,¹ "naturally indignant" at the treatment of his friend, Hallam wrote Tennyson with great good sense:

Professor Wilson has thought fit to have a laugh at you and your critics, amongst whom so humble a thing as myself, has not, as you will perceive, escaped. I suppose one ought to feel very savage at being attacked, but somehow I feel much more amused. He means well I take it, and as he has extracted nearly your whole book, and has in his soberer mood spoken in terms as high as I could have used myself of some of your best poems, I think the review will assist rather than hinder the march of your reputation. They little know the while that you despise the false parts of your volume quite as vehemently as your censors can, and with purer zeal, because with better knowledge.²

But the "surprised sensitiveness" ³ of the poet overcame him when he read Wilson's article in October 1832,⁴ and he published the squib against Christopher North in his next volume.

Wilson retorted in a review of Motherwell's *Poems*, April 1833:

We called not long ago on Alfred Tennyson. We singled him out to do him honour. And thousands on thousands delighted in some of his

¹ Thomas R. Lounsbury, *The Life and Times of Tennyson* (1915), p. 238.

² H. Tennyson's *Memoir*, I. 84.

³ The phrase is Palgrave's: see H. Tennyson's *Memoir*, II. 495. On the page following Palgrave writes also, "In regard to published criticism more than once he remarked that it was his misfortune, and one which he felt unable to remedy, —to be little moved by praise, but long to remember points of censure." Compare I. 145 and 148; II. 85, 120, 164-5, 203, 466, and 473.

⁴ See Tennyson's letter to Wilson, quoted on the next page.

strains, who might, but for us, never have heard their music. Maga loves to scatter wide over the world the flowers of poetry—the pearls and the diamonds. . . .

Motherwell, he adds in the next paragraph, belongs to no coterie :

The adulation of a *set* has not touched or turned his brain, as would seem, from some late manifestations to be unhappily the case with Alfred Tennyson, though he be a metropolitan poet, the new star, no less, of Little Britain. Alfred says in an epigram, with no more tail than an ape, no more sting than a drone, that he can pardon our blame, but not our praise. "I would have been more magnanimous to swallow both and be thankful ; for if he exclude from the circle of privileged admirers, all equally unworthy with ourselves to worship his rising genius, his audience, however "fit," will be found "few" ; and like a caged lark hung out on a tree in a city-court or churchyard, he will be left to himself to "pipe solitary anguish." Alfred is a gentleman ; but he forgot what was due to himself in that character, when he said untruly that he could not forgive Maga's praise, on hearing from whom it came—for he must remember the inscription on a certain presentation copy. William Motherwell, a stronger-minded man by far and away than Alfred Tennyson, and of equal genius, will estimate our praise at its real value. . . .

The last sentence would indicate that the epigram had stung after all, yet the whole passage—even disregarding its being written by a supposedly crotchety septuagenarian—shows mildness rather than implacable wrath.

In the fourth number of *The Greek Anthology*, September 1833, Wilson writes also :

. . . George Trevor is not so testy as Alfred Tennyson, and too good a Christian to be incapable, like a cockney, of forgiving an old man's praise,¹ and in the fifth number of the same series, December 1833, he sneers at the poet in passing :

. . . We laid ourselves on our sofa (not a little white one like the two dimities that simpleton Alfred Tennyson coquetted with in a German Village-Inn,—but a strapping sofa in buff) . . .²

Meanwhile, in February 1834,³ appeared a satirical poem by a submicroscopic atom, one John Lake, and probably some time in that year Tennyson, obviously dreading further attack, sent the following "very manly and generous letter to Christopher North."⁴

¹ *Blackwood's Magazine*, xxxiv. 404.

² *Ibid.*, xxxiv. 991.

³ Lounsbury, p. 292.

⁴ The phrase is Andrew Lang's. See his *Life and Letters of J. G. Lockhart* (1897), II. 88.

Somersby, Spilsby, Lincolnshire.

Sir,

Tho' I am "the star of little Britain," I assure you I do not rise or set there very cordially. I prefer vegetating in a very quiet garden where I neither see nor hear anything of the great world of literature—not lighting even upon *Maga* once a year. Nevertheless in the lack of better things, a composition, mistitled a Satyre, entitled *Criticism and Taste*, and particularly remarkable for the want of either, was forwarded to me, a day or two ago, by the author. . . Now, Sir, hew me piecemeal, cut me up in any way you will, exhaust all your world of fun and fancy upon me, but do not suspect me—tho' I may have done, written, said foolish things, not excepting a silly squib to Christopher North—do not dream that I can, now or ever, own any one grain of sympathy with the ravings of this unhappy coxcomb. I would rather request you, if you do not object to meet me on such dirty ground, to shake hands over the puddle he has made.

Five months after it had been printed I saw the critique¹ from which Mr. L. has drawn his inspiration. I considered it at the time as somewhat too skittish and petulant, tho' it was redeemed to me by a tone of boisterous and picturesque humour such as I love. My gall might have risen a little—that it could never have contained much bitterness the weakness of my epigram ought, I think, to prove; for I trust that you will give me credit for being able to write a better.

I could wish that some of the poems there broken on your critical wheel were deeper than ever plummet sounded. Written as they were before I had attained my nineteenth year they could not but contain as many faults as words. I never wish to see them or hear of them again. . .

Someone (I think M[aginn?]) in his cups told a friend of mine that you were the author of the article on me in the *Quarterly*. I do not believe it; for I could not recognise one spark of genius or a single touch of true humour or good feeling. Moreover, the man misprints me, which is worse than lying—but now that we have shaken hands (for I trust, we have) I find that you owe me an explanation. Somewhere or other you state "Alfred is a gentleman"—to which I answer with Conrade and Borachio, "Yea, sir, we hope": you say afterwards, that I have forgotten what was due to myself in that character, because having previously sent you "a copy with a grateful superscription" I had publicly disclaimed much relish for your approbation. Now upon mine honour as a gentleman, I did never send or cause to be sent any such presentation-copy, or write, indite, or cause to be written or indited any superscription, grateful or ungrateful, to any Editor of any Review or Magazine whatsoever.²

Wilson's reply, if he wrote any, has not been preserved, but he was apparently ready enough to shake hands, according at least to

¹ The *Blackwood* article by Wilson.

² H. Tennyson's *Memoir*, I. 95-6.

his only other references of importance to Tennyson in *Maga*,¹ which appear in February and May 1836, in reviews of Joanna Baillie's *Dramas* and Alford's *School of the Heart*.

He begins the first by lamenting, with somewhat rhapsodical wistfulness, the passing of the poetical giants of his prime.

Not but that there is poetical genius among our young aspirants—the Tennysons, the Trenches, the Alfordes, and others, whom we have delighted to praise; and whom we should rejoice to see shining as fixed stars of the first magnitude in the poetical firmament. Fixed stars of the first magnitude! Why, it was debated in a spouting society in Cambridge—"Is Alfred Tennyson a GREAT POET!" Shakspeare, Homer, Milton, and Wordsworth are Great Poets; and it might have been thought that the mere mention of such names would have silenced the most flatulant of all the praters. The "bare imagination" of such a debate must bring the blush of shame on the face of every man of common sense; and Mr. Tennyson must have wept with vexation at the ineffable folly of his friends who maintained the affirmative. Let him lay to heart the kind counsels of Christopher North, who alone has done justice to his fine faculties, and the laurel crown will ere long be placed on his head. He has yet written but some beautiful verses—a few very charming compositions, that are in truth little poems—not great ones—his feeling is exquisite, and so is his fancy—but oh! how feeble too often his Thought! Feeble because he is a wilful fribble—flattery has made him so—but would he but scorn his sycophants, his strength would be restored, and nature would be glad to see him, what she designed him to be, a *true* poet.

¹ Other allusions are, briefly, these:

In a review of *Clare's Rural Muse*, August, 1835, 38, 232, speaking of the pathetic fallacy, Wilson writes: "The inferior followers of Shelley, Keates, Hunt, and Tennysson, are all addicted to this disgusting practice—and show it chiefly in sonnets. The men we have named are all poets—the creatures we have hinted are not even poetasters."

In a review of Trench's *Story of Justin Martyr*, September, 1835, 38, 425, he incidentally praises the sonnets of half a dozen authors, including Tennyson.

In *Our Two Vases*, May, 1838, 43, 698, he merely names the poet in passing.

In *Christopher in his Alcove*, April, 1839, 45, 546, speaking of contemporary young poets, he praises them for avoiding mystifying expression and gaudy language. "The SUMPHS," he adds, "are all now of the Shelley or of the Tennyson school."

Lounsbury, pp. 489 and 492, incorrectly attributes to Wilson three articles, in the first two of which Tennyson receives mention: James Ferrier's review of *Elizabeth Barrett's Poems*, November, 1844, 56, 636, Archibald Alison's *The Historical Romance*, September, 1845, 58, 341, and William Henry Smith's review of *Festus*, April, 1850, 67, 416. (I am able to give the correct authorship through the courtesy of William Blackwood and Sons.) The article on *Tennyson's Poems* of April, 1849, is the production of W. H. Smith also, as George Saintsbury correctly guessed in *A History of Criticism* (1904), III. 502 note. The author, according to Saintsbury, "misses—he positively blasphemizes—the beauty of many things that Wilson had frankly welcomed," etc., pp. 502-4. Lounsbury, p. 493 ff., discusses this review. He does not mention the author, but recognizes that the article is not Wilson's. An incidental reference to Tennyson occurs also in an article (not by Wilson) of September, 1849, 66, 343.

Of the young poets he writes also on the next page, with typical Northean egotism :

Were it not for Us, where would they be ? Nowhere. Out of Cambridge and Cockneydom, how many scores of Christian creatures have ever seen either of Alfred Tennyson's Volumes ? Not fourscore. In *Maga* many of his best compositions have been perused with delight by tens of thousands—and as sympathy is what every poet most fervently desires, how deep ought to be—and how deep must be—his gratitude to Christopher North ! "Fit audience find though few," was a sentiment very well at the time—for the Poet of *Paradise Lost*. But a young lyrical poet of the present day cannot, do what he will, be satisfied with the applauses of a coterie of under-graduates, though graced with the countenance of the Wooden Spoon of the year, shining in the gloss of novelty almost like horn. He longs for "a waking empire wide as dreams," and he finds it in the most beneficent of perennials whose smile is fame, and whose praise is immortality. Christopher North is the tutor, the guardian, and the patron of the young poets. As they reverence him, they prosper—wanting the light of his countenance, they sicken in the shade, and prematurely die.

In the second he speaks of the delight he derives from almost every new publication, whether in prose or verse : "we often feel as if we had written what we are reading, and blush to be betrayed into admiration of our own works."

There have been some exceptions—and among them perhaps the most conspicuous were the Poems, chiefly Lyrical, by Alfred Tennyson. They contained numerous beauties which we feel to be original and out of our sphere ; and on our expressing our delighted admiration of them, we gave vent to the most unselfish and disinterested feelings that could expand a critic's breast. Their follies were so peculiarly their own, that in printing them, almost without comment, we left them to speak for themselves, and they did so to the general scorn. For conduct so judicious and benign, Mr. Tennyson commissioned a midge to madden and murder us with its fatal sting. A billion midges attacking the face and hands of one old man on a summer twilight might annoy him sorely, and drive him from his avenue into his house. But one midge, the first and last of his race, could not rationally expect to send Christopher North to Hades. . . . We survived the onslaught of the unhappy little insect, who impotently expired "even in the sound himself had made," to afflict, on the earliest opportunity, the ingenious lyrist with our intolerable panegyrics. We are not without hope of driving him absolutely mad ; for his genius is unquestionable, and no comfort he may derive from our ridicule will suffice to make his life endurable under the opprobrium of our praise. True that Wordsworth, Scott, Coleridge, Southey, Campbell, Crabbe, Byron, Moore, Bowles, Montgomery, and Elliot have received

kindly what Alfred Tennyson "with sputtering noise rejected"; but they are gluttons, he an Epicure—

"He on honey dew hath fed,
And breathed the air¹ of Paradise."

Though in February 1836 Wilson mentions Tennyson's two volumes, according to the passage of May he is obviously dealing only with *Poems, chiefly Lyrical* of 1830. Nor has his opinion of those poems apparently changed from his opinion expressed in the review of May 1832 exactly four years earlier. It will be noted also that whereas in the review of Motherwell's *Poems* in April 1833 he shows some irritation at the epigram upon himself, in May 1836 he treats the poet's rejoinder with entire playfulness.

2

In an excellent article of a dozen years ago, *Some Infamous Tory Reviews*, Mr. Walter Graham contrasts Lockhart, who recognized publicly the superiority of the poems of 1842, with Wilson, who "in Blackwood's continued to attack Tennyson until he no longer dared contradict the best critical opinion of the day."² That Wilson attacked the poet in the first place I question; that he "continued" to attack him I question also. Viscount Cranbrook met Wilson at Bowness in September, 1843, and has recorded among other matters his impressions of Tennyson.

I asked him what he thought of Tennyson's *Queen of the May*. "It is very beautiful," he said, "and yet I remember reading the first part of it alone and thinking it very namby-pamby. . . . It is very artistical, as is much of his poetry. . . . Mariana is admirable description, and yet, on the whole, he wants force in his poetry, which is the fault of his school. There is no manly vigour—nothing that stirs the blood. And in one of his poems, if I mistake not, there is an unmanly exultation over someone who had rejected him. Lady Clara Vere de Vere, however, which is on the same subject, is spirited. I offended Tennyson many years ago by what I thought a very favourable review in *Blackwood*, and I was pleased at the time to receive letters from many persons saying they were glad to find Tennyson so well appreciated in Scotland. However, he was displeased at some jocose observations on some of his poems which I thought absurd. He wrote me a short time since saying that I had been right, and he wrong, but still, a man once angry is apt to remain so. I meant well and kindly to him, however, and really thought I behaved so,

¹ Wilson either quotes from memory incorrectly, or casually changes Coleridge's second line to suit his context.

² *Studies in Philology*, October 1925, XXII, 511-2.

as I admired much of his poetry. *Locksley Hall* is forced, and shows a constant straining after effect, and, indeed, the whole new school has a notion that nothing is poetry but what is *intense*; they intensify everything, and those who write in another style may be good versifiers but are not, in their estimation, poets. I don't like them myself. I saw some of De Vere's poems cited in the *Quarterly*, which are much finer, in my opinion: but he is unequal as Tennyson. Much of both is not worth reading."¹

Is not Wilson's chief offence this, that like an old-fashioned gentleman, he failed to admire the new?

Necessarily in this article I have covered the same material to be found in Chapters 8 and 18 of Professor Lounsbury's *The Life and Times of Tennyson* of 1915. In Chapter 8 Lounsbury excellently sums up Wilson's first (and only) critique, of 1832, but his long discussion in Chapter 18 of Wilson's "later attacks" on the poet, his particular stress on the importance of the squib of Tennyson's,² are definitely out of focus. On p. 490 he gives an almost perfect summary of Wilson's attitude:

His [Wilson's] criticisms throughout furnish one of the most striking exemplifications of the fact that a man brought up in one school of poetry is often found absolutely incapable of appreciating the greatness of a writer belonging to a new school.

But instead of resting content with this unexceptionable dictum, Professor Lounsbury must needs present Christopher North as a sort of critical ogre, nursing his resentment at Tennyson's verses addressed to himself and meditating dire revenge.

Lounsbury objects to Wilson's repeated charge that the period of glory in English poetry was over at a time when Tennyson was flourishing. He might as well object to the fact that John Murray in 1830 turned from the publication of poetry to the publication of travels and expeditions; to the fact that about 1835 "Delta" Moir's verses were losing their popularity: "the changed age [was] not so tolerant of poetry as it had been a dozen years before";³ to the fact that John Sterling wrote Emerson on July 18, 1840:

With us poetry does not flourish. Hartley Coleridge, Alfred Tennyson, and Henry Taylor are the only younger men I now think of who have

¹ *The National Review* (1884), III. 153-4.

² According to Lounsbury, Wilson's "resentment for the attack made upon him [*i.e.* in Tennyson's verses] never slumbered" (p. 467), but "loomed up more and more distinctly in his thoughts" (p. 468) and "continued to rankle in his bosom" (p. 470).

³ Mrs. Oliphant, *William Blackwood and His Sons* (1897), II. 173.

shown anything like genius, and the last—perhaps the most remarkable—has more of volition and understanding than imagination ;¹

to the fact that so late as 1864 Harrison Ainsworth told "Ouida" that he abominated the Tennyson school.²

Some of Lounsbury's quotations from Wilson may certainly have two interpretations, and at times the later writer seems to be straining to give them an antagonistic meaning. Thus Wilson's bathetic claim that he in *Maga* has spread the fame of Tennyson far more widely than it would otherwise spread of itself³ is exaggerated of course, but not unfriendly ; his claim for the poet's originality⁴ is genuine, and praiseworthy rather than blamable. As a final example of Wilson's "unconscious revelation"⁵ of his wrath at the lines addressed to Christopher North, Lounsbury quotes the reference to the midge in the article of May 1836 : "Never under an affectation of jovial indifference did a critic betray keener sensitiveness. The wound inflicted by the bite of the midget had manifestly begun to fester."⁶ I can only refer the reader to the last quotation from Wilson which appears on pp. 435-6 of this article, and let him judge for himself.

Lounsbury considers it "morally certain that, in this criticism of Tennyson's second volume [in the *Quarterly* of April, 1833], Lockhart was acting as the mouthpiece of Wilson. . . ."⁷ Moral certainty is difficult to combat, but that Wilson had anything to do with this famous article, not by Lockhart but by Croker,⁸ is mere guesswork.

That Wilson praised other contemporaries, thereby emphasizing his contempt for Tennyson, is hypothetical also. Surely his praise of Sterling⁹ does not have anything to do one way or the other with his neglect of Tennyson ; and his admiration expressed for Macaulay's *Lays of Ancient Rome*¹⁰ in December 1842, shows Wilson's best side if it shows anything : his love for the big bow-wow style

¹ *Correspondence between John Sterling and R. W. Emerson* (1897), p. 34.

² Malcolm Elwin, *Victorian Wallflowers* (1934), pp. 169 and 297.

³ Lounsbury, p. 476.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 478.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 479.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 480.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 32. Compare also p. 315.

⁸ Professor Grierson finally clinches the authorship of this much discussed critique in a note, "Croker and Tennyson," *T.L.S.*, April 24, 1937. "Croker wrote the article, but Lockhart gave it his full approval."

⁹ Lounsbury, pp. 481-3.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 487-9.

and his forgiveness of a formerly bitterly vituperated political opponent. As to neglecting Tennyson in *Blackwood's Magazine* after 1842, Lounsbury has failed to note that according to Mrs. Gordon's bibliography in her *Christopher North*, Wilson contributed only the single article on Macaulay to *Blackwood's Magazine* between March 1840 and February 1845 and that in his articles thereafter, with the exception of a single paper on Byron, he confined himself, in *North's Specimens of the British Critics* and the *Dies Boreales*, to older writers: Pope and Dryden, Milton and Shakspeare.

In a word, Wilson objected, along with the rest of the world and along with Tennyson himself later, to certain puerile poems in the volume of 1830. Tennyson lost his temper, published a squib on the critic in his next volume, and manfully, if somewhat unnecessarily, apologized for it two or three years later. Nobody is likely to take seriously the contemporary who, in 1853, praised Wilson as one "to whose discriminating criticism Wordsworth owes half his fame, and Tennyson his whole poetic existence."¹ But if Wilson never realized Tennyson's true greatness and if Christopher North somewhat patronizingly continued to warn the poet against the supposed dangers of the appreciation of his admirers, long after his true greatness should have been recognized, each was guilty rather of inability to comprehend the new than of premeditated malice. For neither Wilson nor Christopher North was implacable and neither was consciously unfair.

¹ *The Irish Quarterly Review*, June 1853, III. 402.

A NOTE ON THE SHEFFIELD EDITION OF GIBBON'S *AUTOBIOGRAPHY*

By MARJORIE C. HILL

SINCE Murray's publication in 1896 of Gibbon's unfinished sketches of his life, which were the basis of Sheffield's edition of the *Autobiography*, critics and scholars have united in paying tribute to the tact and skill with which Sheffield performed his task ; at the same time, however, they have expressed amazement and dismay at the editorial liberties he exercised in composing the narrative, which has become a classic of its kind. For comparison of the six sketches with the *Autobiography* reveals emendations of phrasing, suppression of parts of sentences, whole sentences, and sections, as well as transposition of parts of one sketch into the body of another. The general character of such tamperings has been briefly noted by Mr. Frederic Harrison, G. B. Hill, and O. F. Emerson.¹ Although he excuses the suppression of material which might have been offensive to Gibbon's contemporaries, Mr. Harrison confesses himself baffled by the exclusion of such Gibbonesque sentences as :

" . . . there was a time when I swallowed almost as much physic as food, and my body is still marked with the scars of bleedings, issues, and caustics."²

and,

" Few works of merit or importance have been executed either in a garret or a palace. . . . Wretched is the author, and wretched will be the work, where daily diligence is stimulated by daily hunger."³

Dr. Hill attributed Sheffield's emasculation of some of the exuberance of Gibbon's style, and many of the suppressions to the editor's

¹ Edward Gibbon, *Memoirs*, ed. O. F. Emerson (Boston, 1898) ; *ibid.*, ed. G. B. Hill (London, 1900) ; Frederic Harrison, " Address " in *Proceedings of the Gibbon Commemoration, 1794-1894* (published by the Royal Historical Society, London, 1895).

² Harrison, " Address," p. 29.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

literary timidity.¹ A careful study of the sketches and the expressions suggests, however, that Sheffield may quite possibly have followed certain statements made by Gibbon himself in the sketches about subject-matters to be excluded from his autobiography, statements to which Gibbon did not always strictly conform. Such an editorial standard explains the suppression of the sentences quoted by Mr. Harrison, and many others; it constitutes perhaps the soundest justification for accepting Dr. Hill's final conclusion that "the new work" (*i.e.* Murray's publication of the sketches) "with all its authenticity and all its additions can never supplant the compilation which has been the delight of many generations of readers."²

Mr. Harrison only slightly exaggerates the freedom with which Gibbon's literary executor worked when he says that there are few pages of the *Autobiography* which read consecutively as Gibbon wrote them.³ The editor's task, as Sheffield saw it, was not that of the modern scholar, concerned with the establishment, restoration, and publication of authentic texts; it was rather the office of the author's assistant, who must compile, according to his own lights and those of his time, the most perfect biography possible from the tentative and unfinished work. Most of the transpositions of material occur, naturally, in periods where the more or less full accounts of sketches B and C, D and E overlap. The method by which Gibbon's famous sentence on his youthful love affair with Mlle. Curchod was composed is well-known;⁴ the equally famous sentence which records the conception of the *Decline and Fall*, found in Memoir E, replaces the account in Memoir C.⁵ The largest amount of material to be transposed is the Memoir C account of Gibbon's militia experience, which is used instead of the longer and probably later B version; to this particular free-handling of the

¹ Gibbon, *Memoirs*, ed. G. B. Hill, pp. xiii-xvii.

² Gibbon, *Memoirs*, ed. Hill, p. xiv; *cf.* p. vi. Each of the sketches is fairly complete for some part of Gibbon's life, though all are unfinished. Mr. Emerson, whose edition goes back to the sketches and is not merely a re-edition of Sheffield, includes all the suppressed material. His edition is especially useful for its full introduction, in which he dates all the sketches more accurately than does Murray's publication. Emerson believes that Gibbon stopped working on the *Memoirs* early in 1792. Sheffield continued to encourage Gibbon, however, and as late as January 23, 1793, wrote to him: "I shall never consent to your dropping the *Memoirs*. Keep that work always going."

³ Harrison, p. 28.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

⁵ Gibbon, *Autobiography* (World Classics edition), p. 160 (hereafter referred to as *Auto.*, W. C. ed.).

sketches I shall recur.¹ In general, such transpositions substitute a more forceful, elegant, or succinct rendering of an idea for the expression of it which occurs in the sketch being used at the moment. Nothing in these changes need be cause for alarm.²

Not so easily will the justice of suppression of phrases, sentences, and sections from the *Autobiography* or changes and emendation of Gibbon's phraseology be admitted. Dr. Hill notes some examples of verbal changes, and calls attention to the diminishing of Gibbon's egoism, that objective sense of his own merit, which was a well-known ingredient of his personality, by means of suppressions; he also points out the elimination of ironic and often opprobrious comment on the English Militia, which might have aroused English patriots, and on the Church, which would have added fuel to the fire which Chapters XV and XVI of the *Decline and Fall* had already heaped on the historian's head.³ Yet had he had space and copy-right permission Dr. Hill might have amplified his analysis of the effect of Sheffield's editing of the sketches, for other strong elements of Gibbon's personality do not appear as emphatically in the *Autobiography* as they do in the sketches.

These characteristics are the independence, forthrightness, and impartiality of his judgments of others⁴ and the realistic, even materialistic temper of his mind. Sheffield has suppressed, perhaps for fear that Gibbon would be charged with ingratitude or, at worst, with haughtiness, the historian's just estimate of his Lausanne tutor's not unlimited intellectual capacity, allowing the tribute to his teaching to stand alone.⁵ The realism of Gibbon's portrait of his father is likewise softened by suppressions, for Gibbon speaks of his father's extravagance and inefficiency as well as of his grace, gentleness, and liberality. On occasion he does not spare him the edge of his irony,⁶ and we may even believe that Gibbon somewhat resented the

¹ Mr. Emerson notes this (p. xlvi) and calls the C account "less satisfactory"; certainly it is more condensed than B, but this is perhaps consistent with Gibbon's focus. Sheffield returns to Memoir B for Gibbon's record of his studies during this period.

² Mr. Emerson restores the original form of the fragments which were used with great freedom of arrangement for the introduction of the *Autobiography*. Actually Sheffield's patchwork makes no change in sense or feeling.

³ *Memoirs*, ed. Hill, pp. xiv-xvii.

⁴ Of himself also; see references to his fault of intemperance, *Auto.*, ed. Murray, pp. 189, 208.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 135; cf. p. 230. Cf. also Gibbon's emphatic denunciation of the intolerance of the *philosophe* group in France. He disliked intolerance outside the Church as well as in it.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 29-33, 47, 218.

financial settlements required of him by his father.¹ If Sheffield balks at such unconventional frankness, we should, perhaps, hardly expect that he would retain Gibbon's penetrating, honest, and self-revealing remarks on his father's death which begin, "the tears of a son are seldom lasting."² Moreover, the enthusiastic list of the "solid comforts" to which he attained after his father's death, the well-furnished house and table, the servants, carriage, and "all those decent luxuries whose value is the more sensibly felt the longer they are enjoyed"³ was also omitted by Sheffield, though Gibbon was noted for his delight in the amenities of life. Again, a personal relationship described by Gibbon with considerable spirit, his friendship in Paris with Madame Bontemps,⁴ does not appear in the *Autobiography*; since it shows Gibbon in a somewhat warmer light and further reveals his delight in society, one wishes that Sheffield had not felt it necessary to exclude it.

A first view of Sheffield's suppressions, then, leads one to the conclusion that his biographical ideals were those of the eighteenth-century panegyrists against whose example Johnson fought so vigorously; and we might suppose he would have been in sympathy with the reviewer of Boswell's *Journal of a Tour*, who advised the great biographer in connection with the announced *Life* that, however far he might lead the reader into Johnson's private life, he ought to exclude anything that would diminish his greatness or sully his virtue.⁵

But Gibbon was himself a student of biography; and although he emphasized the biographical importance of the private life, he had clearly formulated a strict neo-classical focus for his own biography, the portrait of himself as the author of the *Decline and Fall*. He possessed, moreover, a Chesterfieldian sense of decorum. In Memoir B he wrote:

"The review of my moral and literary (*sic*) character is the most interesting to myself and the public; and I may expatiate, without reproach, on my private studies; since they have produced the public writings, which can alone entitle me to the esteem and friendship of my readers. The experience of the world inculcates a discreet reserve on the subject of our person and estate."⁶

¹ *Auto.*, ed. Murray, p. 155.

² *Ibid.*, p. 288.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 307; cf. p. 289.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 204-5.

⁵ J. K. Spittal, ed., *Contemporary Criticism of Dr. Johnson* (N. Y. 1923), p. 186.

⁶ *Auto.*, ed. Murray, pp. 154-5; cf. W. C. ed., p. 87.

Throughout the sketches statements of subject-matter to be excluded or, at least, avoided as much as possible, appear, and Sheffield, when confronted with the problem of putting together the final form from the sketches, apparently tried to guide himself by these principles. Three subjects, which may be listed under the headings "person and estate," (1) his pecuniary affairs, (2) his health, and (3) his sexual life, he calls subjects not proper for him to deal with in his autobiography. In Memoir C, for example, he says :

"I shall not expatiate [more minutely] on my economical affairs, which cannot be instructive or amusing to the reader. It is the rule of prudence, as well as of politeness, to reserve such confidence for the ear of a private friend, without exposing our situation to the envy or pity of strangers ; for envy is productive of hatred and pity borders too nearly on contempt."¹

On his health he is not less emphatic :

"Of the various and frequent disorders of my child-hood my own recollection is dark ; nor do I wish to expatiate on so disgusting a topic. I will not follow the vain example of Cardinal Quirini, who has filled half a volume of his memoirs with medical consultations on his particular case ; nor shall I imitate the naked frankness of Montagne, who exposes all the symptoms of his malady, and the operation of each dose of physic on his nerves and bowels."²

In speaking of his early love for Mlle. Curchod, he distinguishes it from Gallic gallantry, and from "that grosser Appetite, which pride may affect to disdain" ; he then goes on to say :

"The discovery of a sixth sense, the first consciousness of manhood, is a very interesting moment of our lives ; but it less properly belongs to the memoirs of an individual, than to the natural history of the species."³

These subjects Gibbon barred through a sense of decorum ; three others, anecdotes and portraits, accounts of travels, and contemporary history, were to be excluded to preserve his focus. In Memoir B he says :

"As I am now entering on a more ample field of society and study, I can only hope to avoid a vain and prolix garrulity by overlooking the vulgar crowd of my acquaintance, and confining myself to such intimate friends among books and men, as are best entitled by my notice by their

¹ *Auto.*, ed. Murray, p. 291 ; cf. W. C. ed., pp. 175-6. Bracketed words omitted by Sheffield.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 37, 154, 220 ; cf. W. C. ed., p. 21.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 150.

own merit and reputation, or by the deep impression which they have left upon my mind."¹

The latter two principles are succinctly expressed as follows :

"The narrative of my life must not degenerate into a book of travels."²

"It is not the purpose of this narrative to expatiate on the public or secret history of the times."³

It was necessary, nevertheless, for Gibbon to speak both of his childhood ill-health and his worldly estate, since the former affected the character of his early education and the latter made possible his life of leisurely study. The remark beginning "Of the various disorders of my childhood," etc., is preceded by a general description of these disorders, which Sheffield has omitted ; in so doing he loses the sentence the omission of which Mr. Harrison regrets.⁴ Sheffield has similarly eliminated the details of Gibbon's financial arrangements with his father, and the final settlement of the estate after the elder Gibbon's death.⁵ One regrets the loss of several typically Gibbonesque sentences with these sections,⁶ though Sheffield retains the personal and focused part of the idea of which the second sentence, whose suppression was noticed by Mr. Harrison, is the conclusion.⁷ Gibbon's caveat against his sexual life may have caused the exclusion of the Gibbon's account of his friendship with a certain Madame Bontemps and his remarks on his resolve to continue his bachelor existence though not without temptation to change it.

Certainly Gibbon must have had such digressive and anecdotal biographies as that of Cibber in mind (or perhaps he was thinking of Boswell) when he wrote :

"It would most assuredly be in my power to amuse the reader with a gallery of portraits and a collection of anecdotes ; but I have always condemned the practise of transforming a private memorial into a vehicle of satire and praise."⁸

¹ *Auto.*, ed. Murray, pp. 165-6, 307, n. ; cf. W. C. ed., pp. 94, 176-7.

² *Ibid.*, p. 199 ; cf. W. C. ed., pp. 126, 143.

³ *Ibid.*, W. C. ed., p. 198.

⁴ *Ibid.*, ed. Murray, p. 37 ; the sentence quoted by Mr. Harrison occurs in Memoir B, which was not used by Sheffield at this point ; the same sentence in a slightly different form does, however, appear in Memoir F, which was used, and was omitted as indicated. S. also omits Gibbon's remarks on the prenatal state.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 155-6, 289-91.

⁶ For example : "My patrimony has been diminished in the enjoyment of life," *ibid.*, p. 291.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 291-2.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 307, n.

In any case that common fault of biography, the blurred focus, was avoided by Gibbon, when he set himself against the inclusion of travel notes, anecdotes and portraits, and the history of the times. These principles he followed far more carefully than he did those which related to his private life, and to this clarifying of the function of biography Gibbon owes his importance in the history of the form. Yet it is apparently in conformity to the principle just quoted that many of Gibbon's lively and frank opinions of his contemporaries were suppressed. And the substitution of the Memoir C record of his militia experience for the longer B description, which descends "from the general idea of a militia to the militia of England in the war before last; to the state of the regiment in which he served," and only then to "the influence of that service on his personal situation and character,"¹ may be accounted for by the last principle, the exclusion of the "times" in favour of the "life."

Such suppression of material could hardly be carried out without somewhat reducing the revelation of Gibbon's character in the *Autobiography*. One facet of Gibbon's relation to his father disappears with his account of the high-handed character of the financial arrangement he agreed to at the age of twenty-one; a picturesque figure of speech goes out because it is attached to some more or less well-known person, and a characteristic sentence because it is concerned with his health. Yet, in general, the suppressed portions confirm rather than contradict the impression of Gibbon's character as revealed in the *Autobiography*; and the number of suppressions which may be classified according to Gibbon's own principles seems to point to the fact that Sheffield consciously or unconsciously guided himself by these signposts. The fact that the editor's tact and skill was exercised so often in conformity with the neo-classical Gibbon's own biographical standard provides us with an additional reason for accepting the conclusions of George Birkbeck Hill and others that Sheffield's edition remains a valid edition of Gibbon's autobiography.

¹ *Auto.*, ed. Murray, p. 178.

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

FREE BULL

ALTHOUGH I am a student not of Chaucer's works but of economic and social conditions in mediæval England, I have come upon a certain amount of information bearing on a passage in the *Parson's Tale* which, so far as I know, has never been adequately discussed. Chaucer is condemning the incontinence of some village priests, and uses the following effective simile to drive the point home: "Swiche preestes been the sones of Helie, as sheweth in the Book of Kynges, that they weren the sones of Belial, that is, the devel./Belial is to seyn, 'withouten jугe'; and so faren they; hem thynketh they been free, and han no jугe, namoore than hath a free bole that taketh which cow that hym liketh in the town./So faren they by wommen. For right as a free bole is ynough for al a toun, right so is a wikked preest corrupcionn ynough for al a parisshe, or for al a contree."¹

To appreciate what a *free bull* was, one must recall the agricultural arrangements of the so-called "open-field" system, which was in force over great stretches of England and north-western Europe during the Middle Ages. An open-field village was a compact group of dwellings and other buildings surrounded by a wide expanse of unbroken, unenclosed arable fields. The fields were divided into two or more great sections, in each of which the villagers held equal amounts of land. These sections were submitted to a customary rotation of crops, unvarying from year to year. For instance, a common arrangement was to divide the field into three sections, and every year one of them was sown with winter grain, one with spring grain, and one was left fallow. Over the fallow field throughout the year and over the stubble of the other fields after the crops had been carried home ranged the cattle of the village, in a unified village herd under the tending of the village herdsmen. And, as is clear from the passage in the *Parson's Tale*, the increase of the village herd was provided for by allowing a bull to run at will

¹ *Parson's Tale*, 897-9.

with the herd, as the bulls run with the herds on the western ranges in the United States to-day.

In later times the village bull was provided by the parson or by a committee of villagers appointed for the purpose, but in the Middle Ages the providing of the bull was a privilege of the lord of the manor, and this privilege was called *tauri liberi libertas*.¹ In short, the "free bole" in the *Parson's Tale* is not merely a descriptive expression; it is a technical one. It represents a franchise which could be defended at law. For instance, William de Losa possessed the franchise of free bull in Hamsted and in the 16th year of Edward I was allowed 4s. damages for the impounding of the bull (*pro imparcatione eiusdem tauri*). His free bull had been made not free.²

References to the franchise of free bull are reasonably common in documents of the thirteenth century, and are often associated with a similar franchise of a boar. For instance, in the Hundred Rolls of the early years of the reign of Edward I, Richard de Clifford is recorded as holding five yardlands, a manse, and a mill in Niwenton, Oxfordshire, *et habet liberum taurum suum per totam villam in omnibus feodis et locis*.³ In the rolls of an assessment of one-thirtieth of the movable goods of the inhabitants of the realm, made in 1283, which survives for the Hundred of Blackbourne, Suffolk, a free bull is recorded for about half of the villages of the Hundred.⁴ The franchise is usually held by the chief lord (*capitalis dominus*) of the vill, but occasionally a second important landholder also has a free bull, which shows that, for one reason or another, the statement in the *Parson's Tale* that "a free bole is ynough for al a toun" does not hold for every town. In general, the lord's franchise of free bull seems to have been a custom widely in force in central and south-eastern England in the thirteenth and in the early years of the fourteenth century.

Probably the tenants of a lord who had the franchise of free bull had to recompense him in some way for the use of the bull. I have encountered no specific references to a payment of this sort, but presumably one existed, for the tenants found the exercise of

¹ See *Rotuli Hundredorum*, ii. 487.

² DuCange, *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis*, s. v. *taurus*.

³ *Rotuli Hundredorum*, ii. 848. See also *ibid.*, ii. 402, 487, 862, 864; *Cartularium Monasterii de Ramseya* (Rolls Series), i. 283, 295, 308, 321, 332; D. C. Douglas, *The Social Structure of Medieval East Anglia*, p. 171; G. G. Coulton, *Medieval Village*, pp. 196, 198.

⁴ E. Powell, *A Suffolk Hundred in 1283*, *passim*.

the franchise by the lord burdensome enough to make them willing to buy him out. Thus Henry de Bray, one of the chief lords of Harleston, Northamptonshire, held the franchise of free bull in that vill. In 1309-11 a series of agreements were made, between de Bray on one side and the other two chief lords of Harleston together with the twenty-eight free tenants of the vill on the other, whereby, in return for the use of a certain two acres of pasture, de Bray quitclaimed "*dominium tauri sui et apri. Ita quod praedictus Henricus nec heredes sui seu assignati nullum taurum nec aprum in campis de Herleston blada neque prata pascentes in communi habebunt in perpetuum.*"¹

Furthermore, if perhaps Chaucer borrowed his remarks about the free bull from a French source of the *Parson's Tale*, it is important to note that this custom was current also in mediæval France.²

This incident of the free bull shows that historians of mediæval agriculture cannot neglect the information which the literary as well as the economic and legal documents of the time may give them. It perhaps shows also that interpretation of many passages in the literary masterpieces of the Middle Ages is impossible except in terms of the ageless background of village custom against which they were written.

GEORGE C. HOMANS.

"BUT THIS AND THEN NO MORE" (HARL. MS. 7392):
A NOTE ON THE SUGGESTED ASCRIPTIONS TO
DYER AND TO GORGES.

THIS poem is at least tentatively ascribed to Sir Edward Dyer by its recent editor, Professor B. M. Wagner,³ and likewise by the latest editors of *The Arte of English Poesie*.⁴ The ascription is based not only on internal evidence but also on some external evidence, which is offset, however, by perhaps equally strong external evidence indicating "Gorges" as the author, "Maister Gorge" as Puttenham calls him: probably Mr. Arthur Gorges (he was not knighted

¹ *The Estate Book of Henry de Bray*, ed. D. Willis (Camden Society, Ser. 3, vol. xxvii.), pp. 12-14. For another interesting case see *ibid.*, p. 93.

² M. Bloch, *Les caractères originaux de l'histoire rurale française*, p. 83.

³ *R.E.S.*, xi, 1935, p. 469.

⁴ *The Arte of English Poesie*, by George Puttenham, ed. G. D. Willcock and A. Walker, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1936, p. 326.

till 1597).¹ Puttenham quotes a single couplet as by Maister Gorge; the newly discovered lament in which it now appears, somewhat differently worded, is signed *G.O.R.* But (and here lies the puzzle) the same poem contains three other groups of lines that Puttenham cites, ascribing two of them to Dyer and the third to "a louer". Thus probabilities grounded on ascriptions cancel out: this could be Gorges' poem, Dyer's poem, any man's poem. The editors of the *Arte* are perhaps even more than fair to Gorges' claim when they remark: "Although the internal evidence of the poem . . . renders it possible (and even probable) that it was Dyer's, the external evidence is, perhaps, slightly in favour of Gorges. Not enough of Gorges' work is extant to provide *criteria* for discussion of the poem's authorship."

True, Gorges' early verse is lost—the lays of love and pity, and the "brave" and "sweet" *Eglantine of Meriflure*, which Spenser praised in 1591. But a considerable body of his verse remains from the decade 1609–1619;² and in spite of its later date, it furnishes a serviceable basis of judgment, particularly the elegy for Prince Henry, 1612, which is both "brave" and "sweet" and in all ways very Spenserian. On the evidence that it affords, supported by the prevailing quality of his other, less personal and emotional, verse writing, one can with some confidence assert that Arthur Gorges did not write "But this and then no more." The couplet, as Puttenham quotes it, isolated, Gorges might have composed;³ but the full poem that embodies it, I feel sure he never wrote.

¹ The assumption that Puttenham's Gorge is Arthur Gorges (often written *Gorge* at the time) is fairly safe, since there seems to be no record of poetic effort by other members of the family with courtly connections (such as his father Sir William, his uncle Sir Thomas, his cousin Sir Ferdinando); whereas Sir Arthur, a courtier of Raleigh's circle and pursuits, had written verse as early as 1590 which is explicitly praised by Spenser in *Colin Clout* (384 ff.), and during the first half of James's reign wrote a good deal of verse, which is extant. (See my account of Gorges' career, *P.M.L.A.*, XLIII, 1928, pp. 645 ff.)

² Verses to the royal family, dated "1^o: Janua: 1609" [probably 1610], in MS. Royal 18 A XLVII.—*The Olympian Catastrophe*, 1612, ed. Randall Davies, F.S.A., Cayme Press, 1925, from the MS. now at the Huntington Library.—Verse translation of Lucan's *Pharsalia*, pr. 1614.—Verse translations in Bacon's *Wisdom of the Ancients*, which Gorges translated from the original Latin and published in 1619; in so far as I have tested them, these translations would seem to be by Gorges himself.

³ The couplet as Puttenham quotes it is two six-beat iambs; in the Harl. MS. poem the lines are six and seven beat, alternating, i.e. in Poulter's measure. That measure, so far as I know, Gorges never used. However, he did, once, use the precise form of Puttenham's couplet in a single six-line stanza, one of the six complimentary strophes, all differently built, which make up the 1610 New Year's gift to the royal family. The stanza is a highly formal "motto," written in gilt

For he was one of the "lingering Spenserians" in Stuart times. The cadences, the impact on the ear of his elegiac poetry are more subtle, more melodic, more flexible than the regular, heavy iambic beat of "But this and then no more." He makes little use of marked *cæsura*. Though the line-endings are strong, they tend to run on, with the phrases weaving in and out of the linear structure to give an effect quite alien to that of the poem in question. Gorges even uses the Spenserian linking of stanzas by a run-over construction. His imagery is of *Astræa's* flight unto the sky, of glory scaling the star-bright firmament. The lament for Henry is of the year 1612. It is improbable, to put the case mildly, that about 1590—when Spenser was alive and potent, and composing an elegy for Gorges' dead young wife—Gorges would be writing love-plaints sounding not in the least like Spenser; but that twenty years later, when the poetic world had moved on to newer measures, he should write in the dead poet's vein, and even definitely echo some of his phrases. (See the examples at the end of this note.)

Moreover, it is highly probable that the 1612 elegy incorporates some of Gorges' early writing, dating back to the time of the publication of Puttenham's *Arte* (1589). In all his writing, prose and verse, Gorges is an inveterate harker-back and a borrower from himself. In 1619, addressing Buckingham on the state of the Navy, he still talks of the "invincible-invisible" Armada in the old terms and with the worn old tales of '88; into the 1612 elegy itself he works an incident that he has related in his account (c. 1607?) of the Islands Voyage, which took place in 1597. I think it likely that some of the heroic sweetness of the lost *Eglantine* may be preserved in the *Olympian Catastrophe*, the more so because some of Spenser's lament for Gorges' dead Daphne (1591) here reappears, its cadence and wording only slightly altered, as Princess Elizabeth's plaint at the loss of Prince Henry (see the examples below). In short, the 1612

script and enclosed in an illuminated frame, which serves as a gloss to an exquisite drawing of the three feathers and the Ich Dien of the Prince:

"Whilome this Subiect Crown, a Sou'raigne Crown pursu'de:
When that Heroik Prince a mighty Kinge subdu'de.
Then did these Plumes, so well the Brawle of Poytiers daunce:
As that the wronge was quail'd, y^a brau'd his Right in France.
Thus thundred that greate Mars of Britaine, tearmed black:
Yet, of Greate Brytaines force, did half Great-Brytaines lack."

Obviously this is ceremonial: it is stiffer in movement even than any of the other tributes, all of them being somewhat more personal in tone; and it is far more mechanical than any of his other verse. A personal plaint written in that measure, as is the Harleian poem, would not sound in the least like Sir Arthur Gorges.

poem can be taken as representative of Gorges' early poetry—that of the late eighties and nineties. And it is as unlike the verse of “But this and then no more” as is the “sunne-shine light” of Henry's promise unlike the gloom that wraps Olympus at his untimely death. The following short excerpts from the *Olympian Catastrophe* are offered in illustration of Gorges' elegiac manner: ¹

But yet I thus in Poesie haue read,
That Somnus hath two Archytecturd gates
To his darke cell, where he in heben bedd
Snorteth securlie free from care or fates.
One of the which is cleare transparent horne,
Tother luorie such as the gazing Morne
Hath to hir Cabynet, now these that passe
By the hornye entraunce, to theire nightlie rest
Doe ofte behould (as in a lookinge glasse)
Truths true Idea with hir naked breast. . . .

Why fell he then amidst his floweringe race,
Whilst yet his bud was greene and fresh his rynde,
Whilst he exceld in eury gifte and grace,
That is admired most in humane kinde. . . . ²

and

The worlds faire rowling eye withdrew his beames,
And (postinge towards Thetis purple bedd)
His steedes he watters in the western streames,
And in the ocean dippes his gold-beamd head. . . . ³

No praise for Poesie do I affect
Nor flatteries hoped meed doth me encite
Such base borne thoughts, as servile I reiect
Sorrow doth dictate, what my zeale doth write
Sorrow for that rich tresor wee haue lost
Zeale to the memory of what wee had
And that is all they cann, that cann say most
So sings my Muse, in zeale and sorrow clad
So sunge Achilles to his siluer harpe. . . .

[From the sonnet “To the Reader” prefacing the *Olympian Catastrophe*.]

HELEN E. SANDISON.

¹ From the Huntington Library MS. I have in preparation an edition of the work, prose and verse, of Sir Arthur Gorges.

² Cf. Spencer, *Daphnida*, the elegy for Gorges' wife, l. 239:

She fell away in her first ages spring,
Whil't yet her leafe was greene, and fresh her rinde,
And whil't her braunch faire blossomes foorth did bring,
She fell away . . .

³ Cf. *Daphnida*, l. 22:

. . . . the wearie Sun
After his dayes long labour drew to rest,
And sweatie steeds now hauing ouer run
The compast skie, gan water in the west. . . .

Cf. many passages in the *F.Q.* and also the lark song in *Cymbeline*.

THE DISPENSARY, SIR RICHARD BLACKMORE,
AND THE CAPTAIN OF THE WITS

THE history of the efforts of a number of public-spirited members of the College of Physicians to establish as early as 1687 a dispensary for the "Sick Poor" in London and of the attempt of the apothecaries and their allies within the College to quash the plan has been told more than once. That the rising physicians Garth and Blackmore took opposite sides in the quarrel is likewise well known. But there are one or two phases of the matter, involving the great Dr. John Radcliffe and the very minor Tom Brown, which have not yet been noted. In order to explain these details I remind the reader that in December 1696 fifty-three members of the College made sure of their dispensary by contributing ten pounds each to a central fund and publishing an explanation of their project with a list¹ attached of the subscribing physicians. Sir Richard Blackmore, although a member of the College, was not among them.

A few months later, while plans were progressing, there issued from the press a pamphlet entitled *Physick lies a Bleeding, Or the Apothecary turned Doctor. A Comedy, Acted every Day in most Apothecaries Shops in London . . . By Tho. Brown.*² In thoroughly impudent fashion the author dedicated his piece to one "Dr. J. B.," formerly an apothecary. The work itself, an inexperienced little play or dialogue, discusses the greed, deceptions, and the dangerous pretensions to medical knowledge of the apothecaries. But Thomas Brown, audacious journalist, author of lampoons and successful translations, was no way concerned in this "dull Scoundrel Pamphlet", as he hastened to advertise,³ and he did "utterly disown it".

Why he should have been so eager to repudiate this work in defence of a project of which several of his friends approved can perhaps be inferred from his epithet "dull". As for the "scoundrel" nature of the pamphlet, that appears in an insulting admission in the dedicatory epistle that Tom Brown had "a pretty good stock" of impudence and would willingly abuse almost anybody. The query arises, then, why—except for the fact that he was by this time

¹ Reprinted in the Preface to *The Dispensary. A Poem . . . The Fourth Edition*, 1700.

² Printed for E. Whitlock, 1697. I have used photostats of a copy in the Henry E. Huntington Library.

³ In *The Post Boy*, May 8-11, 1697, and *The Post Man*, May 11-13.

well-known both as hack and satirist¹—should Brown have been chosen to be insulted at the same time he was made the sympathetic champion of the righteous cause of the dispensarians? Such management looks like plain clumsiness, and we might leave the matter there. But because Brown had so much criticism to offer of the conduct of physicians and yet numbered several, especially Dr. Edward Baynard and Dr. James Drake,² among his friends, one wonders if there was more in the case.

Almost simultaneously with the printing of *Physick lies a Bleeding* there appeared a collection of *Familiar Letters: Written by the . . . Earl of Rochester. And several other Persons of Honour and Quality*, which was edited by Brown and dedicated to Dr. John Radcliffe. This famous and eccentric physician had attended the royal household frequently, and had already begun the series of benefactions to Oxford University which were to perpetuate his name there. In his dedication Brown thanked the doctor for having acknowledged by some tangible kindnesses the pleasure he had derived from Brown's writings. Radcliffe's liberality with his money was, indeed, almost the only one of his personal characteristics which his detractors did not question. It is surprising, therefore, that when we seek evidence that this rich and philanthropic Fellow of the College of Physicians helped to found its dispensary, none appears. Dr. Johnson, relying upon an unidentified contemporary pamphlet, says in his life of Garth that Garth and Radcliffe were leaders of opposite parties of physicians, but whether the basis of their dispute was politics (Garth was a Whig and Radcliffe reputedly a Jacobite) or the dispensary he does not say. The biographers of Radcliffe ignore the question altogether. One should notice that Whiggish Sir Richard Blackmore in his *Satyr against Wit* spoke flatteringly of Radcliffe, and that shortly afterwards, when Blackmore was commanding a broadside attack³ upon a group of wits including Garth, Dr. Drake (a Jacobite), and Dr. Colbatch, all dispensarians, he defended Radcliffe. I believe, therefore, that we may conclude that the dispute between Garth and Radcliffe to which Dr. Johnson refers was not entirely on political grounds. Indeed, it seems altogether possible that

¹ His famous lampoon on Louis XIV did not appear, nor did his arrest for it occur, until the autumn of this year, but his translation entitled *Marriage Ceremonies . . . in all Parts of the World*, not a delicate book, had been advertised in March (*The Post Boy*, March 4-6, 1697).

² Both were intimates by 1697. Drake subscribed to the dispensary; Baynard, who practised mostly at Bath, did not.

³ *Discommendatory Verses, On those Which are Truly Commendatory*, 1700, p. 7.

Radcliffe, a man of low birth who refused a baronetcy¹ and whose social and professional eccentricities were as famous as his prescriptions, was being odd again to the extent of refusing to co-operate with his more conventional colleagues and, instead, had allied his witty self, perhaps merely because he liked to startle people, with the unpopular "City Bard" Blackmore and the anti-dispensarians.² In that case, Brown's haste to disclaim *Physick lies a Bleeding*, which was in support of the dispensarians, would, of course, relate to his hopes from the dedication of the Rochester *Letters* to Radcliffe. And the person who wrote *Physick lies a Bleeding*, knowing apparently of the dedication or at least of the friendly relationship between "poet" and anti-dispensarian patron, tried thus to stir up trouble between them.

Garth's *Dispensary* was printed in 1699, but it had already circulated in manuscript. Sir Richard Blackmore may have known early that in Canto IV Garth handled his verse roughly and scornfully ranged him with the conspiring apothecaries. Revenge for those slurs, as well as gratuitous moral exhortation to all the wicked poets of the town, Sir Richard attempted in his *Satyr against Wit*.³ Garth was there paid off among a disordered catalogue of offenders. The list is long and, from both social and literary points of view, impressive. Of the group, says Blackmore, "Their Captain Tom does at their Head appear."⁴ Although no scholar has troubled to identify the leader of this distinguished company, he should be identified, apparently, with Tom Brown, the alleged author of the attack upon Blackmore's party in *Physick lies a Bleeding*. At the end of the *Satyr* the knight-physician alludes superciliously to the "Apothecary's Trade" as if to remind people of his professional superiority to the class to whom, in objecting to the free distribution of medicine, he had joined himself.

The storm raised by the *Satyr*, like that created, and for similar

¹ Cf. the article on Radcliffe in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. We also learn from Pittis (*Some Memoirs of the Life of John Radcliffe*, 2nd ed., 1715, p. 12) that Radcliffe's apothecary died worth fifty thousand pounds.

² Radcliffe, who was constantly embroiled in disputes, soon became an enemy of Blackmore. That phase of his career is entertainingly set forth by Mr. T. F. M. Newton in "Blackmore's Eliza," *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, XVIII (1935), pp. 111-23. Mr. Newton errs, I think, in suggesting (p. 120) that Radcliffe supported the dispensary; no evidence is offered in support of the statement.

³ Dated 1700 but printed by November 23, 1699. Cf. *Works of John Dryden*, ed. Scott and Saintsbury (Edinburgh), I (1882), p. 352.

⁴ *A Satyr against Wit*. The Third Edition, 1700, p. 6.

reasons, by Collier's *Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage* (1698), was lively, complex, and not without dust and heat. I do not propose to survey the entire disturbance but only to penetrate the clouds in the direction of Tom Brown. For if Blackmore, as now seems certain, was the one who began the quarrel with Brown, Tom's persistence in tormenting his lumbering adversary was not due, as is sometimes imagined, to spontaneous malice.

In addition to the *Satyr against Wit* there was another provocation to Brown, a slurring allusion to him and his unsteady friend William Pittis in an anonymous poem, *Poetæ Britannici*, which came out shortly after the *Satyr*. Although Brown ordinarily did not bother to reply to such small attacks, he was now aroused. In a letter¹ to "Sir W. S——", dated January 8 [1700], he scoffed at the latter "vile, lowsie Panegyric" and condemned the *Satyr* in an unusually careful analysis based upon French theories of poetry. By a defence of the Honourable Charles Boyle he also tied this quarrel to the more fashionable controversy of the wits against Dr. Bentley. At the end of the letter Brown gleefully expressed his willingness to support a "pious" plan of "Squibbing him [Blackmore] with Epigrams."

In due course the epigrams appeared, bearing the title *Com-mendatory Verses, On the Author of the Two Arthurs, And the Satyr against Wit* (1700), and Brown was more than generous with his contributions, the bantering dedication as well as several sets of sarcastic verses being his. The other contributors to this attempt to extirpate the doctor's poetry are notable: Sir Charles Sedley, John Dennis, Christopher Codrington, the Earl of Anglesea, Creech (the translator of Lucretius), Sheffield, Steele (as usual, in defence of Addison), and the Countess of Sandwich are all present, the last-named taking the honours, perhaps, for indelicacy in abuse.² There is much here about Sir Richard as physician, but nothing about his opposition to the dispensary. Instead, the venture seems to have been animated largely by the *esprit de corps* of the "Oxford wits" banded together against Bentley.

Blackmore quickly replied in a disagreeable collection of *Dis-*

¹ Printed in *Familiar and Courtly Letters, Written by Monsieur Voiture . . . And a Collection of Original Letters . . . By Mr. T. Brown*, 1700, sigs. P₂^v-P₇.

² The contents of the volume, reprinted in the *Works of Mr. Thomas Brown* (1720), IV, 75-90, is surveyed in J. T. Harlow's *Christopher Codrington* (Oxford, 1928), pp. 94-6.

commendatory Verses, On those Which are truly Commendatory (1700), again singling out Brown as captain of the wits and charging that he was paid by Codrington, a young man of fashion and wealth. Scattered through the pages of the booklet are slurs also upon Drake, Garth, and the "noisie Cures" of "B—d" (perhaps Brown's friend Baynard, who was something of an author) and complimentary references to Dr. Gibbons, one of Garth's targets, and to Dr. Radcliffe. Probably Blackmore felt he had finished with the wits.¹ It seems likely, too, that he hoped he had heard the last of his opposition to the dispensary, for as time passed and this philanthropic institution became an established part of the work of the College, opposition to the principle of its organization must have seemed a mistake.

But Brown took particular delight in reviving the knight's connection with mere apothecaries. The volume of *Familiar and Courtly Letters* of Voiture, which contained Brown's letter to "Sir W. S—" and which he apparently edited, contained also an unsigned letter "To a Physician in the Country" about the war between the physicians and the pestle-and-mortar men. The "Cheapside Hero" Blackmore, we are told, devotes himself wholly to the latter, and "Rhimes as well as Prescribes to the use of their Shops." The letter, reprinted in 1701, appeared once more in 1705 to offend the knight's pride.² In 1702, when Brown amplified his *Amusements Serious and Comical*, he inserted a comic passage on Sir Richard, who "tell's a Story admirably well in a Coffee-house, if Apothecaries and Surgeons are Judges."³ And during the remaining two years of his life he rarely neglected a chance to scoff at the poet-physician who with unconscious flattery had twice alluded to him as the leader of the wits of the town. The worm turned once more in 1708; Blackmore then⁴ sneered at the poverty and dullness of the "poor Devil Brown," now four years dead, and again spoke of him as the foremost representative of the "Scribbling Rakes." It is an interesting aspect of the Whiggish bard's psychology that he,

¹ It was probably not Blackmore but some ally or allies that gave Brown a further drubbing as libeller and drunkard in *An Epistle to Sr. Richard Blackmore, Occasion'd by The New Session of the Poets* (1700), and as the "Little Penny Poet of the Town" in *A Satyr against Satyrs* (1700).

² I quote from the *Works of Monsieur Voiture . . . Containing His Familiar Letters to Gentlemen and Ladies*, 1705, and from the section with separate title-page (*Translations and Original Letters. By Mr. T. Brown . . . 1701*) in vol. I, which obviously was separately printed.

³ *Amusements Serious and Comical*, 1702, sig. D3.

⁴ *The Kit-Cats. A Poem*, 1708, p. 13.

almost alone of writers ancient and modern, seems habitually to have thought of Grub-Street Tom as a man who in spite of wretched poverty consorted with fashionable and even aristocratic writers. Brown, who knew very well how far he was from actual acceptance by such society, had found the vulnerable spot in the physician's armour. A knighthood and interminable epic poems could not wholly retrieve a social self-assurance lost in the congenial company of vulgar apothecaries.

BENJAMIN BOYCE.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE EDITOR, *The Review of English Studies*.

SIR,

I have learned so much from Professor Saurat, both when I agree with him and when I dissent, that if I demur to his correction of my view¹ it is because I wish very much to get to the bottom of the matter. Does he really believe that Milton meant his readers to understand from the words uttered by God in Book V that the Son of God was "begotten," in the sense of "generated," that day, was not only not co-eternal with the Father but was "generated" subsequent to all the angels, including Satan? I cannot believe this. Milton would have stamped his poem at once as grossly heretical, whereas, as I have pointed out, Bishop Newton recognizes that Milton is using the language of Psalm ii. 67, repeated in the Epistle to the Hebrews i. 5, and accordingly makes no charge of Arianism.

To come to the heads of Professor Saurat's argument: (1) Of course I should, strictly speaking, have said "the Son" and not "Christ," but this makes no difference to the particular argument. (2) "Satan does not use Grierson's argument, because he has a greater argument ready: he denies creation altogether. The angels are self-begot, self-raised": I cannot think that an opinion is a stronger argument than a fact. Satan, as Saurat reads, states dogmatically that we, the evil angels,

Know none before us, self-begot, self-raised.

The first half of the sentence gives, I suppose, his reasons for the second. But it is only an opinion—if not a lie—as Satan admits

¹ See *R.E.S.*, No. 54 (April, 1938), p. 225.

later in Book IX, 134 ff., when he is musing over the creation of mankind :

hee to be aveng'd
And to repaire his numbers thus impair'd,
Whether such vertue spent of old now faild
More Angels to Create, if they at least
Are his Created or to spite us more,
Determin'd to advance into our room
A Creature form'd of Earth, . . .

The words which I have italicised show what is Satan's thought about the origin of the angels—he knows in his heart that they are created beings, but his pride would like to think otherwise. Mr. Saurat must not forget that Satan is

composed of lies
From the beginning—and in lies will end.

Moreover, in his immediate reaction in Book V to the announcement "This day . . . etc." there is no evidence that Satan took the words to imply "generation." When he lies awake his mind is

fraught
With envy against the Son of God, that day
Honour'd by his great Father, . . .

"Honour'd"—not "generated," *i.e.* "exalted," as Milton interprets the word used in the Psalm and the Epistle to the Hebrews. Nor, as I have said, does Satan clinch his argument about being self-begot by adding that Abdiel's statement is obviously absurd in view of what has taken place that day. Mr. Saurat says that "One cannot argue from what Satan does *not* say." But there is a very important exception to the rule that one may not argue from silence, and this is one. If in a serious debate my adversary advances a weighty argument and I in reply pass it over in silence, it is a fair assumption—at least provisionally—that I cannot answer the argument which I ignore. If I make no reply to Mr. Saurat's correction of my work in a vital point, he is justified in assuming that I accept his correction—but so far I do not.

To discuss adequately the rest of his argument would take up too much space for a letter. I *have* read the whole three pages that he refers to. I do not accept his statement that the word "begot" as interpreted by Milton puts on the same level "generate" and "exalt," though both may be processes in time. Nor is the pre-existence of the Son and of every other creature in God's eternal decree of the same kind. The Son is begotten of the Father. The

others are created through and by the Son. Nor can I follow the argument that unless the Son had been generated thus later there would have been no ground for rebellion. The exaltation was enough. Vondel found sufficient reason in the Incarnation and the exaltation of human nature. "If the Son had been known from the first to have created the world, there would have been no cause for rebellion"—so Professor Saurat says, but Abdiel already knows. Satan is in his pride denying what he knows. He is the father of lies.

As for the proofs of Milton's Arianism which Mr. Saurat cites in his closing paragraph, there is nothing there which Milton did not find authority for in Scripture and use to support to own contention of the Son's inferiority to the Father. See his long and well-buttressed chapter five of Book I in the *De Doctrina*. But these texts have not in general given great trouble to the orthodox Trinitarians, because they exemplify, even within the equality of the God-head, the perfect relation of the Son to the Father. It is so obvious as to need no labouring that there is much in *Paradise Lost* which is not in the *De Doctrina*: poetic elaboration drawn from Milton's own imagination and from sources patristic, scholastic, classical, Italian, etc. It is another thing to say that Milton contradicts in the poem essential doctrines laid down in the *De Doctrina*, and is willing to make the Son "first of all created beings," a junior to Satan, against which Milton has guarded himself by his definition of "begotten" and by his use of the exact language of Scripture.

Yours, etc.,

H. J. C. GRIERSON.

REVIEWS

Firumbras and Otuel and Roland. Edited by MARY I. O'SULLIVAN. (Early English Text Society, Original Series, 198.) London: Oxford University Press. 1935 (for 1934). Pp. lxxxviii+191. 18s. net.

THE Fillingham MS. containing copies of these two romances was rediscovered in 1907, after having long been supposed lost. It now appears in print for the first time, edited with a full introduction, a glossary, and an appendix with passages from the mediæval Latin pseudo-Turpin.

Professor O'Sullivan gives a detailed account of the literary problems. She concludes that *Firumbras* is based on a lost French original and *Otuel and Roland* on a lost French version of the Turpin; and for certain passages in *Otuel and Roland* she assembles parallels from *The Kyng of Tars* and from *Roland and Vernagu*. She reproduces a hitherto unprinted letter (dated 1801) to Fillingham from Ellis, who makes one or two comments on the MS. On p. xxii the editor suggests that the white hart (F 1055-72) that leads Richard of Normandy across the river is reminiscent of the white doe in *Guigemar* (which, by the way, does not lead the hero "across water to the Otherworld," as Professor O'Sullivan says, but merely tells him of the experiences that are to befall him; he makes his way alone to the water's edge, and is carried in a self-propelling boat to a city that has no obvious connection with the Otherworld). She also remarks on the presence in *Firumbras* of Hoel of Nautes, who is to be compared with Geoffrey of Monmouth's Hoel (though there may be some doubt as to whether the MS. really reads *Hoel* in F 1374; see collation below).

Professor O'Sullivan seems to assume (p. xxv) that when *Firumbras* contains prayers that are not in the French original, "clerical influence" is the reason; and she quotes F 177-8 and 1071-2. But these prayers are stock devices of the romance style, being subjective comments of the author on the events of his story; and, of course, the comments are sometimes curses, as in *Havelok*, 334, 446. Pro-

fessor O'Sullivan is able, from the additional evidence provided by *Firumbras*, to confirm Gaston Paris' hypothesis of a Charlemagne cycle in four parts. She ends her literary introduction with the deduction that *The Kyng of Tars* was influenced by *Otuel and Roland*. It is clear that she was chiefly interested in the literary background of her text; and this is the best part of her book.

The section on phonology has been sufficiently discussed in other reviews. A good deal might be said on the text and the linguistic problems, which the editor has not handled adequately. There are enough errors of transcription to justify a collation of the MS. (see the corrigenda at the end of this review); though most of these are probably due to the fact that Professor O'Sullivan was working from rotographs. Apart from such errors, many textual difficulties remain in the printed text. The following are some outstanding points

Firumbras

149. *dude hys wyzt and hys strengthe*: *wyzt* should probably be emended to *myzt*. Cf. 606: *they dedyn al here myzt*.
383. *That the fyrst scheltrom thay felt hem to grounde*: the MS. *felthen* should be understood as *felden* (with the orthographical interchange of *th* and *d* that is common in this text).
405. *so*: the obvious emendation to *no* must be made.
449. *vnredy* makes poor sense in this context, and in view of the rhyme on *abyde* is probably a corruption of *vnryde*.
- 603 *Here stedys they asayedden, they lyked hem ful wel*: the MS. reading *asayleden* should be retained. In view of the context, it might be regarded as an instance of the sense "make trial of" that *assail* is known to have; but more probably we are dealing with an example of the sense "mount" (lit. "leap on to"), which is recorded only once in the *N.E.D.* (*assail* v. I), but which is sometimes borne by O.F. *assaillir*.
- 1,320. *Euyl pryst on þey heued*: read *þryft* "fortune, fate," and delete the entry "*þryst* sb. thirst" from the glossary.

Otuel and Roland

214. The MS. (see corrigenda below) reads *Men shall deme the ryzt sawe*. *Sawe*, however, is probably an error for *lawe*, in the sense of "just verdict"; palæographical confusion of long *s* and *l* is not improbable, and *deem* (*the*) *law* is a phrase which, though rare, is established by three examples in the *N.E.D.* under *deem* v. (only one instance being known in M.E.). The emendation is confirmed by the fact that the corresponding passage from *Roland and Vernagu*, 788 (introd. lxxv) has *lawe*, not *sawe*. In any case, *sawe* is not a verb meaning "to behold," as is stated in the glossary.

318. *dere worth* should be printed as a single word and glossed "costly" (see *N.E.D. dearworth*); the entry under *dere* in the glossary must go out.
442. *brouzt ous dere*: read *bouzt*, "redeemed," which is often found in this sort of context.
453. *god and stonys*: read *gold*, and cf. the parallel in 1,440-1.
734. *At*: read *Ac*, which is plainly necessary.
914. "*ffyztep*" he sayde, "(in) better wone": the emendation is unnecessary, for the MS. version is good idiomatic M.E. For similar use of the phrase *good wone* as a complement of this kind (for which no preposition is needed), cf. *Havelok*, 1,907, and *The Kyng of Tars*, 635.
- 1,089. *He smot hym þoruȝ þe lyuer þat he ne flycted, fer ne ner*: *flycted* is a scribal error for *flytted*, "escaped, got away." Cf. the similar couplet in *Sir Degare*, 571-2:

He smot þe kyng in þe lainer:
He miȝte flit nother fer ne ner.

- 1,218-9. *And an haberioun þat bryȝt shon þat lyȝt was for to lete*: *lete* rhymes with *dede*, *bede*, and *drede*, and should probably be emended to *lede*. The sense seems to be "to wear," and is clearly related to the meaning "to have at one's disposal" found in the following examples (and not recorded elsewhere): . . . *hys stede As good as any man myȝt lede*: *Otuel and Roland*, 312; *Armur of the beste That eny knyȝt myȝt lede*: *ibid.*, 353; . . . *hors . . . was wurȝ an hundryd pounde, Ony kyng to lede*: *Athelston*, 388 ff. Godefroy quotes one instance of a parallel use of O.F. *mener*, and glosses it "se pourvoir." These examples explain the rare alliterative phrase *lede* (a) *lortschyp*, *Gawain* 849 and *Castle of Love* 306
- 2,249. *sch(r)yлле*: the emendation is unjustified, since *schylle* is a genuine word.

The following are a few of the corrections necessary in the glossary:

- aduys*: not "farewells" but "considered plan" (modern "advice"). The phrase in which it occurs, *tokyn her aduys*, is a regular one meaning "to deliberate; decide on a plan of action". And it should be noted that the MS. might be read as *aauys*, in which case "farewells" would be out of the question.
- assoyn* here means not "excuse" but "delay"; see under *essoyn* 2, *N.E.D.*, for the phrase.
- nape* in *hys schyn as a nape* does not mean "back of the neck," but is probably the word *ape*, with the initial *n-* attracted from the indefinite article *an* (cf. the stock examples *nickname* < M.E. *ekename* and *newt* < O.E. *efeta*).
- pekke mod*: this rare and interesting phrase should not be glossed "change one's tune" (as also by Brunner in his edition of *The Seven Sages*

of Rome), but "became angry, was enraged", with *mod* in the sense "anger". *Pekke* is obscure and difficult; it seems to mean "to get, have an access of". For the general sense, cf. the similar phrase *fecche mood*, recorded once in a context that supports this rendering: In herte he gynneþ *fecche mood* And lokeþ as he were wood (*Kyng Alisaunder*, Laud MS., 1,093-4).

vndyrname: not "took up, rebuked" but merely "heard, took due notice of."

vyterly: not "entirely" but "assuredly" (for *wyterly*).

We must supplement the editor's remarks on syntax (lxxxii) by reference to the rare construction illustrated in *Otuel and Roland* 150-2:

And 3ut hath my lord garcy
Don aered in Lumbardy
 A burgh that ys ryche.

For this exceptional use of the past participle after *don* in the sense "to cause, give orders (to have something done)," cf. *Hous of Fame*, 155; and see Skeat's note on the line for other references. It is worth noting that the *sententia* found in *Orofe*, 551-2, occurs in *Otuel and Roland*, 2,538-9: Wel 3e seth how it geth: There nys no bote of mannys deth.

In the following collation of the MS. no account is taken of the editor's treatment of final flourishes nor of divergences from the MS. in respect of capital letters, since the use of capitals may be left to an editor's discretion. It should be noted, however, that initial long *i* of the MS. has unjustifiably been printed in Miss O'Sullivan's text as a capital; in that position it is merely an orthographic variant of *i* (cf. the similar use of *v* and *u*). Since in this MS. *s* is often written for *f*, and *f* for *s*, I have not pressed for readings of this kind that the context shows to be wrong (e.g. *laft*, 96; *arblaftrys*, 202). The editor's readings are placed first throughout:

Firumbras

10 *to fere*: probably *tofore*. The cross-stroke of *f* happens to have tapered off just where the *o* was written, and it just passes through the *o*, so as to give the appearance of *e*. If *o* is the correct reading, a finite verb has probably dropped out of the text—perhaps *yserved*, for which cf. 26-7—after *tofore*. 20 *hande*: *harde*. 23 *bowe*: probably the MS. should be read as *vowe*. Cf. the *v* in *blyve* 60, in *olyve* 51, in *haven* 107, and in *savely* 242. 31 *tobrost*: perhaps *tobrest*. 39 *Rowland*: *Rowlond*. *eny*: probably *ony*. 59 *vp*: *up*. 64 *h(e)*: *h* appears to have been crossed out by the scribe—there is a faint line through it. It may have been an erroneous anticipation of *h* in *hym*. 65 *Lucafer*: *lucafor*; also

in 82. 100 *no*: *ne*. 136 *sone*: *oone*=*onone*. 207 *wate* (em. to *wite*): *wete*. 212 *feld down*: *fel a down*. 215 *subythe*: *suvythe*, for *suuythe* (i.e. *swythe*). 242 *safely*: *savely*. 247 *florys*: rather *stonys*. The *n* is illegible, but the first two letters are almost certainly *st*: *florys* makes nonsense, while *stonys* "gems" fits the context well. 286 *Ne*: probably *Me*, which is required by the context (cf. 223-4). 322 *hande*: probably *honde*. 336 *Rooyse*: *Reyse*; cf. 362, with *ryse* used in a similar context. *gonfaucons*: *gonfanovns*. 340 *meddeys*: probably *moddeys*; the second *d* seems to have been altered from something else. 360 *aduys*: perhaps *auys*; cf. 608 below. 405 *so*: *no*. 5,111 *amaraunt*: *ameraunt*. 532 *Richard*: *Richrad* (erroneously). 568 *stertt*: *stert*, the second stroke being just a flourish (for which cf. *knyzt*, 583). 588 *armin*: *armur*. 612 *sverdys*: *suerdys*. 669 *sayd*: *sayde*. 746 *ywedde*: *y wedde*. 798 *hath*: *hathe*. 838 *assaut*: the footnote should be deleted. The MS. reads *no saut*, which is certainly correct. 870 *mesage*: *message*. 881 *thryue*: *tryue*. 900 *ys*: *po*. 970 *saw*: *sow* (which should be emended to *sorw*; cf. *sow* for *sorw* in 1,095). 973 *furpurmore*: *firpermore*. 995 *as*: *as a*. 1,082 *styrapys*: *styropys*. 1,097 *Serbn*: the first letter is probably not *s*, but *b* (or *v*?) these are difficult to distinguish). Again in 1,150; *was good*: *was a good*. 1,119 *autar*: *autur*. 1,195 *beseged*: *byseged*. 1,241 *the*: *pe* (MS. *pe*). 1,274 *forthe*: *ferthe*. 1,284 *capys*: probably *copys*. 1,374 *Hoel* (emended from *Noel*, according to the editor); MS. perhaps *joel*, with a capital long *i*, such as is to be found in 1,444. 1,381 *chyialrye*: *chiualrye* (*i* not dotted in the MS.). 1,428 *were*: *wore*. 1,530 *pourz*: *poruz*. 1,565 *sunne*: *sune*. 1,566 *thoru3*: *thorou3*. 1,582 *poruz*: *porou3*. 1,595 *sarisins*: *sarsins*. 1,772 *longens*: read *longeus*. 1,781 *whenne*: *wenne*. 1,784 *loye*: evidently a misprint for *loye* (MS. *joye*).

Otuel and Roland.

115 *yvyll*: *grylle*. 140 *garsye*: *garceye*. 188 *dred*: *drede*. 214 *thone*, emended from "MS. *done*": but MS. reads *deme*. 271 *lyst*: *lyest*. 365 *bryztt*: probably *bryzte*. 382 *settyyn*: *fettyn*. 418 *foe*: *foo*. 505 *hyzt*: *lyzt*. 506 *by(t)wene*: MS. probably reads *bytvene*. 530 *Erste*: *Efte*. 542 *hape*: perhaps *hope*. 543 *drepe*: *drope*, with the lower part of the loop in *p* reaching back to the previous letter in the normal way. 548 *At*: *Ac*. 574 *fyzt*: *syzt*. 608 *anduswere* (in footnote): *ananswere* (for an *answere*). 704 *in goode wys wede*: the word *wys* has been crossed out in the MS. Evidently the scribe erroneously repeated *wys* from *vnwys* at the end of the preceding line. 730 *wyl*: *vyl*. 779 *dany*: *denys*. 795 *flytte*: *slytte* was probably intended by the scribe. The loop of the *l* reaches back to the previous letter, and there is no cross-stroke reaching to the left of the latter. In any case, *slytte* is required by the context. 835 *bare*: *bere*, with the main stroke of the *r* close up against the *e*. 869 *zendyrware*: *zendyrward*. 873 *ewer*: *ower*. 917 *ffy-a-devlys*: probably *ffy-a-deblys*. 954 *veche*: perhaps *boche* (for *bothe*); cf. *Otuel* 2,277: *Hard he layde on bothe syde*. 1,050 *ys*: *hys* (both times). 1,085 *langars*: *langares*. 1,092 *bassinnet*: *bassnet*. 1,127 *slewe*: *slawe*.

1,128 *rived*: probably *rwed* (cf. *sued* 1,122). 1,160 *How*: perhaps *Now*. 1,174 *good*: *god*. 1,175 *Otuel*: *Otul*. 1,268 *my myschaunce*: *my schaanee*. 1,299 *Bothe*: *Bope*. 1,309 *That he deth*: *That to deth*. 1,337 *ous*: *eue* (cf. *and adam*, immediately following). 1,402 *scheuyn*: perhaps *schouyn*. 1,419 *fouzt*: *souzt*. 1,474 MS. not *schaiue*, as in footnote, but *schame*, with the first minim crossed out. 1,475 *nyl last*, emended from *nye last*: the MS. reads *nys laft*, which should be retained. 1,589 *Ac*: *At* (erroneously). 1,706 *angulaiittes*: no dot in the MS.; perhaps *angulantes*. 1,762 *cristened*: probably *cristenes*. 1,821 *thon*: *tho* (there is a dirty mark, not an abbreviation, above the *o*). 1,865 *othyrr*: *othyrr*. 1,920 *hende*: probably *honde*. 1,982 *Clerk ye*: *Clerk ys* (for *clerkys*). For this *s*, cf. *As* in f. 71 r, line 3, and *ys* in line 11. 2,002 *slepe*: probably *sipe*. 2,018 *paumpylayne*: *paumpyloyne*. 2,135 *peses*: *peces*. 2,208 *when*: *whom*. 2,412 *yom*: almost certainly *gom*. 2,241 *fand*: probably *fond*. 2,262 *Bey*: *Sey*. 2,516 *tor*: *ter*. 2,557 *on*: *an*. *hyzt*: *lyzt*. 2,566 *peys*: *prys* (in the phrase *wynne prys*; cf. OR 2,668, 2,729). 2,586 the name *Gage* is discernible, and may safely be adopted. *Leuen*: perhaps *Heuen*; this at any rate must be embodied in the text, as an emendation if not as a reading of the MS.

Professor O'Sullivan has made a preliminary contribution to the study of these two texts. Somewhat remains to be done.

G. V. SMITHERS.

Wit and Rhetoric in the Renaissance. By W. G. CRANE.
(Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature No. 129.) New York: Columbia University Press;
London: H. Milford 1937. Pp. viii+285. 17s. 6d. net.

THIS is a work whose usefulness consists largely in its material; Mr. Crane frankly disclaims any considerable critical enquiry. The "objectives" of his study (stated not, as one might expect, in the Introduction but in the Epilogue) were, he says, "merely to indicate the relation of wit to rhetoric in the sixteenth century and to present the more important processes of rhetoric which were common knowledge in the Renaissance, with some illustration of their application in English prose." The first seven chapters are mainly concerned with explanation of rhetorical terms, description of the numerous text-books of rhetoric and collections of aphorisms, with some analysis of the derivation of their contents; one of Mr. Crane's conclusions is that "the only English rhetoric which goes beyond translation or close paraphrase is Thomas Wilson's *Arte of Rhetorique*, 1553." The relation of logic and rhetoric, the place of rhetoric in education and its relations to literary criticism are also discussed;

and the connection of wit and rhetoric is certainly made clear by implication if not systematically demonstrated. The gradual narrowing of the sense of the word "rhetoric" in the sixteenth century is perhaps not given sufficient weight. The continuance of the mediæval tradition might be more fully considered; and we also need a clearer distinction between the different kinds of reading public for which these books were originally intended. In an appendix are included quotations from some of the works discussed; these are useful in themselves, but the choice seems rather random, the passages are not quoted with literal accuracy, and some of the references are erroneous. (For instance, the quotation from *Palladis Tamia* is from the edition of 1598, not, as stated, from 1634.)

The remaining five chapters, still mainly descriptive in method, suggest the importance of rhetoric in such literary forms as the moral discourse, the essay, and the formal character. Of wit and rhetoric in Elizabethan poetry and drama Mr. Crane says hardly anything, but he refrains rather because he realizes the magnitude of such a study. He does incidentally remind us that Abraham Fraunce's *Lawiers Logike* (1588, written 1581) and his *Arcadian Rhetorike* (1588) are copiously illustrated respectively from the *Shepherd's Calendar* and from Sidney's poetry. Such facts obviously have their place in the movement of which Puttenham is a chief representative; and much of Mr. Crane's information helps to solidify the critical background of the *Arte of English Poesie*, so vividly sketched by Miss Willcock and Miss Walker in the introduction to their edition, which apparently appeared too late for Mr. Crane to refer to. The indirect value of his work, like theirs, is perhaps chiefly that of placing long familiar works such as *Euphues*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, and Bacon's *Essays* in an unfamiliar and illuminating intellectual context; and many similar conclusions could doubtless be formed by the reader from the material here presented.

Mr. Crane says that he has not attempted to present his information "in the manner of Charles Lamb." Such an attempt with such a subject-matter would have been as unexpected as unwelcome. One might however legitimately expect more grace of style, a more lucid arrangement, and the removal in revision of numerous trivial repetitions of the same points in different chapters.

KATHLEEN TILLOTSON.

The Textual History of Richard III. By DAVID LYALL PATRICK. Stanford University Publications, University Series. Language and Literature, Vol. VI, No. 1. Stanford University, California: Stanford University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1936. Pp. 153. Paper wrappers, 9s. net.

THIS re-examination of the problems presented by the Quarto and Folio texts of *Richard III* is prefaced by a brief chronological account of the textual preferences and opinions of editors and critics from Pope to the present day (Ch. I), followed by a demonstration, mainly on the evidence of its economizing of actors, that Q represents an acting version of F (Ch. II). The three following chapters (III-V), the kernel of the matter, record and discuss the evidence that Q was a memorial reconstruction of the play by its actors, and later chapters consider, as corroborative evidence of this conclusion, the matter peculiar to F (Ch. VI) and to Q (Ch. VII).

A broader basis of comparison than the dialogue variants would undoubtedly have established some of Professor Patrick's conclusions more firmly. As they stand, however, his arguments that F is the earlier and more authoritative text, that Q represents (as many critics have held) an acting version of the play, and that its numerous variants from F can as a whole be best explained as due to memorial transmission are convincing. Less satisfactorily substantiated is the suggestion that the text of Q was not surreptitiously put together, but represented prompt copy, originating in the taking down of the players' recollection of their lines and in the adaptation of these to a reduced cast, preparatory to the company's provincial tour in the summer of 1597. I can see no indication that Q represented prompt copy, and the statement that "entrances are usually marked well in advance of the actual movement of the actor" seems not to be the case, as they appear, with very few exceptions, either immediately before the first speech of a character who enters within a scene or immediately before his entry is apparent from the dialogue. "To define exactly the method by which the quarto text originated and by which it reached the printer" is, however, for Dr. Patrick a secondary matter, perhaps incapable of solution (p. 148). It is now, however, the crucial problem presented by the texts of this play and calls for a closer investigation of the possibilities than has yet been made.

In spite of some errors in statements bearing on secondary

problems and some wavering in the suggestions offered towards their solution, Dr. Patrick's work represents a solid contribution to the textual study of this play. His primary case for the memorial transmission of Q is cogently argued and exhaustively illustrated, and readers will find much that is clarifying and refreshing in the sound common sense he brings to bear on the general and individual problems presented by its variants.

ALICE WALKER.

Two Pamphlets of Nicholas Breton. Grimellos Fortunes (1604). An Olde Mans Lesson (1605). Edited with an Introduction and Notes by E. G. MORICE, M.A. Published for the University of Bristol by J. W. Arrowsmith, Ltd., Bristol. 1936. Pp. 127. 5s. net.

MODERATE-PRICED and carefully edited reprints of the less accessible pamphlets of the Elizabethan age are always welcome, and especially is this so when the pamphlets are those of a writer like Nicholas Breton, whose works, save for a few well-known poems, have always been more talked about than seen. Welcome as the present volume is, however, its contents will probably disappoint many readers whom the eulogies of the older critics, with their curious tenderness for Breton, have led to expect too much. It must, I think, be admitted that the two pamphlets here reprinted, however worthy, are far from first-rate. They suffer from that dreary and depressing mental outlook which pervades the later Elizabethan literature of improvement, a "morality" which seems to find pleasure in representing everything in the darkest colours and to see little or nothing that is good in our life upon earth except the ending of it!

The first, and better, of the two pamphlets deals with the theme of the university graduate who has tried his hand at a variety of employments in the hope of earning a living, but who has met everywhere with nothing but roguery in his fellow employees and ill-fortune in his own attempts. In the other an old man catechizes his son, who has just returned from a tour through foreign countries, in which he seems to have gathered regrettably little which is either of interest or importance. Both pamphlets are in dialogue-form, and in the latter there is much of what seems to be intended as witty, or at least pointed, repartee—but the wit has worn very thin. They are both good enough examples of their peculiar style, but it is a style which is singularly artificial and wanting in appeal.

In an introduction of ten pages the editor summarizes and discusses the books reprinted and their sources, giving parallels for the occasional stories which Breton introduces, the most notable being the old tale of the talking bird which betrayed a wife's proceedings in the absence of her husband: an Eastern tale which in one form or another is of great antiquity. Of the other incidental stories there is really not much to be said; and there is, so far as is known, no definite source for either of the pamphlets as a whole. The editor considers that the correspondence with John Heywood's *Proverbs* "seems too large to be accidental," but I should question this. Many Elizabethans were lovers of proverbs and there seem in Breton's phrasing to be no particularly close parallels with Heywood.

The tracts are printed from copies in the Folger Shakespeare Library. I have read portions of the text with the British Museum copies and it seems to have been prepared with great care and accuracy. In one or two cases the editor has, I think, misread the text, unless the Folger copies differ from those of the British Museum, but it is clear that these deviations were not due to carelessness but to misunderstanding. I have noted the following points.

P. 37, l. 5. The editor reads "Well couched" and has a note "Grosart alters this to couched, possibly a rash emendation in a passage so full of obscure slang." But in the B.M. copy, at any rate, the word *is* "couched": the "h" is indeed damaged and partly choked with ink, but it cannot possibly be a "k" of the fount of the book. The words seem to mean no more than "well put," which is good sense in the context. Four lines later we have the odd word "Ambodreter." This in the B.M. copy is "Ambodxeter," which is presumably a mere transposition-misprint for the not infrequent "Ambodexter." The editor has perhaps not realized the very small difference between black-letter *r* and *x*, but even if this was the case his note is strangely confused. He gives us, as an explanation of "Ambodreter" part of Nares' gloss of "Ambodexter," and adds to it "'Ambodreter, he that can play on both hands' (Heywood, *Proverbs*, page 24)." When, however, we look up this reference, we find "*Coll under canstick, she can play on both hands*"; and no mention of "Ambodreter" (or "Ambodexter") at all! This, however, seems to be a single aberration in what is otherwise quite a sound piece of work.

The curious "*Pu-rulines*" at p. 41, l. 6, is perhaps no more than a misreading of "*Vn-rulines*." This might well happen if the

upstroke of the V in the manuscript, perhaps in an Italian hand, had an excessive curl. At p. 42, l. 4, the "sufficient Block for Frogges to leape uppon" is surely a reference to the well-known fable of the frogs who desired a king and were given, first a Log and then a Stork. At p. 42, l. 13, "flauering" should be "slauering," and lastly, at p. 44, l. 9, it would surely have been better to correct "Bellawaie" to "Bell awaie."

It may be noted that both pamphlets were evidently printed by Edward Allde, to whom all the ornaments used in them belonged at the time.

R. B. McK.

Seventeenth Century Studies. Presented to Sir Herbert Grierson. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1938. Pp. xvi+415. 21s. net.

A REVIEWER who could speak with authority on all that this volume covers might well congratulate himself on having avoided the dangers of "the modern spirit of high specialization" at which Professor Sisson glances in his expository essay on "King James I as Poet and Political Writer". For in this collection we find Motin and Vondel as well as Herbert and Milton, Calderon as well as Dryden and Corneille, Poussin and Inigo Jones as well as Lawes and Purcell, Pascall and Leibnitz as well as Hobbes and Locke—a list which is by no means exhaustive. In fact, it may be said at once that the characteristic figures and movements in seventeenth-century letters, art, and philosophy are all represented, and represented well. But having gone so far to make the collection completely representative, it is a pity that the editors did not go two steps farther and procure an essay on a historical theme—one from Mr. G. M. Young on the lines of his *Charles I and Cromwell* would have been welcome—and an essay to represent the energies which so many men of the seventeenth century put into antiquarian pursuits.

Some of the themes are familiar enough, but it is a pleasure to see how freshly they can be treated. The story of the Phalaris quarrel has often been told, but never so well as by Mr. Garrod—not even by Jebb in his *Bentley*. Jebb gives us more information, but Mr. Garrod's is the better narrative and the shrewder criticism of the protagonists' motives. Similarly, a man might well suppose that our generation has said all that it can profitably say about the merits of Donne's love poetry; but even the most jaded will be

stimulated by the debate between Mr. Lewis and Mrs. Bennett, Mrs. Bennett for the defence, Mr. Lewis cast in his now familiar part as the critic of contemporary heresies. A further instalment of his work on Herbert comes from Canon Hutchinson. His defence of the traditional order of poems in *The Temple* will be further developed, we hope, in a more suitable place—the introduction to his long-expected edition. At least two other essays on familiar themes must be mentioned: Dr. Metz's "Bacon's Part in the Intellectual Movement of his Time," an attempt to judicate between the two estimates of Bacon which acclaim and deny his merits as a scientific innovator; and Professor Legouis's "Corneille and Dryden as Dramatic Critics," a useful expansion of the three pages which W. P. Ker allotted to the subject in his edition of *Dryden's Essays*.

Several contributors offer expositions of seventeenth-century texts. For example, Mrs. Bennett in the course of her reply to Mr. Lewis suggests yet another interpretation of Donne's *Aire and Angels*; Professor Bullough surveys the forces of the opposition which Bacon attempted to meet when he defended learning in *The Advancement* from "the zeal and jealousy of divines," from "politiques," and from learned men themselves; and Professor Martin shows that the "climate of thought" in the seventeenth century was becoming favourable to the inspiration of Vaughan's *The Retreate*. Professor Tovey in an essay on "Words and Music" incidentally propounds a difficult problem:

Harry, whose tuneful and well-measured song
First taught our English Music how to span
Words with just note and accent . . .

"*First taught*"? Professor Tovey is led to assume that Milton must have "completely forgotten, if he ever understood, the principles of that madrigalian art of which his own father had a respectable mastery." And so it would seem. But is it possible to believe that an accomplished musician like Milton can have had so short a memory? Wilbye, one of the greatest of the madrigalists, died only ten years before this sonnet was written, and Tomkins, who studied under Byrd and published a set of madrigals as late as 1622—"a very fine set" in Dr. Fellowes's opinion—did not die until 1656. This is only one of the details in a most interesting essay which it is hoped Professor Tovey will develop. Mr. Eliot starts from two odes of Cowley, and presents us with three different

conceptions of Wit: Cowley's definition, to which Donne might well have subscribed, and the more familiar descriptions from Dryden's "account" of *Annus Mirabilis* and Johnson's *Life of Cowley*. The comparison is so profitable that it is to be regretted that Mr. Eliot did not see fit to add those lines from the *Essay on Criticism* (ll. 289-304) which occasioned Johnson's remarks. This would have been a good opportunity to display Pope's famous definition in its proper context.

Two of the three essays on Milton seem to have been provoked by Mr. Eliot's note in *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, 1936. Mr. Binyon contests the opinion which Mr. Eliot then expressed that Milton was deficient in visual imagination, and shows that the "instrument" which Milton used conditioned the kind of picture which he made. Professor Praz, who notices a similarity in Mr. Eliot's criticisms of Milton and the usual criticism of neo-classic art, develops a pretty exact parallel between Milton and Poussin, reinforcing it from the critical precepts of Tasso.

Enough has now been said to show that this collection is a work of permanent importance and in every way a worthy testimony to the scholar for whom it was made.

JOHN BUTT.

The Miltonic Setting, Past and Present. By E. M. W. TILLYARD. Cambridge University Press. 1938. Pp. xii+208. 7s. 6d. net.

THIS is a collection of essays and articles by the foremost English Miltonist of to-day and one of the main themes is "to defend (Milton) against modern defamation." This is pleasant and even amusing. To the Continental student it is a source of wonderment and even bewilderment that Milton should be "defamed" nowadays. It is true that in France the eighteenth century is still a battlefield, but the seventeenth is considered to be at rest. But the great questions still alive in England were fought out in the seventeenth century; I think it can be said Milton was among the vanquished; so why not forgive him? That he should be called to-day "a cad and coward" by Mr. Belloc really characterizes Mr. Belloc and not Milton.

On more precise points, though I always read Dr. Tillyard with pleasure and profit, I cannot always agree with him. In reviewing Professor Grierson's work, Dr. Tillyard states (p. 73) that "Professor Grierson has recalled us to the truth that Milton's main doctrines

as expressed in *Paradise Lost* were those of Evangelical protestantism. Even the Arianism which is explicit in *Christian Doctrine* he proves to be absent from the poem. True, he ignores Milton's mortalism—but in other respects Milton was orthodox."

Now, Arianism is absent from *Paradise Lost*, but that is because Milton was not an Arian. His enemies called him one only because they did not know what to call him and the word "Arian" was handy. And to say that Milton was orthodox in other respects seems to me to go against the facts. How can Milton be called orthodox when he does not believe in the Trinity, nor in the existence of the soul, when he believes in free-will and in the goodness of matter as part of the very substance of God?

I agree that Milton was a protestant in the double sense given by Dr. Tillyard (pp. 76, 78): "to stand alone and to accept responsibility; and a belittling of all material and adventitious props in exercising this responsibility." But that is an odd definition of Protestantism and indeed would apply to free-thinkers as well.

The Protestant (p. 83) accepts life "for himself, and having done so," (he is) "somehow content to allow others to make their own terms."

Now this seems to me very un-Miltonic. The greatness of Milton seems to me to come from a fierce belief in the justice of God, absolute and total; to be "somehow content to allow others" does not fit into that picture. For Milton, Man is free to shape his destiny, but retribution is inevitable and awful.

By his insistence on the liberty of man, I should say that Milton was *not* in the main line of the protestant tradition from Luther and Calvin. That is one of the chief points in which Anglicanism is not protestant, but is a compromise which somewhat veils the issue to English minds. By his insistence on the inherent goodness of matter as part of the substance of God, Milton really is not even in the true Christian tradition: the *ex nihilo* is essential to Christianity; the *ex Deo* is not Christian.

Such essential points cannot be ignored in speaking of Milton. One feels almost impolite in insisting on them after reading Dr. Tillyard's urbane, humane, and human book, in which every page gives pleasure; but Dr. Tillyard's amiable tendency to prove that all is well with Milton from the Evangelical point of view (and what is that?) must not go unchallenged, even by friends.

DENIS SAURAT.

The Poems of Ambrose Philips. Edited by M. G. SEGAR.
(The Percy Reprints No. XIV.) Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
1937. Pp. lvi+192. 10s. 6d. net.

AMBROSE PHILIPS is one of those authors who do not in themselves deserve to be read, but whom the scholar who, in the words of a great scholar lately deceased, "means to build himself a monument" must spend much of his life in reading. He illustrates the "spirit of the age." If he was to be re-edited, it was desirable that the task should be done well, and it is hard to see how it could have been better done than by Miss Segar. She has given us the first complete and correct biography, some admirable notes, sixteen poems not included by Philips in his collected edition of 1748, and, together with that of 1748, the original, 1709, version of the Pastorals, the one that was praised by Addison and Steele, and admired and then ridiculed by Pope.

In the Pastorals, the downright absurdities are not so numerous as Pope, after he had been offended by the *Guardian's* praise of Philips and neglect of himself, tried to make out. On the other hand, we must agree with Johnson that the praise bestowed upon them was excessive:

Men sometimes suffer by injudicious kindness; Philips became ridiculous, without his own fault, by the absurd admiration of his friends, who decorated him with honorary garlands which the first breath of contradiction blasted.

There is only one really memorable line, in the 3rd Pastoral, l. 56:

And rule the peaceful Empire of the Field;

and, as though to compensate for this, there occur in the same Pastoral more superfluous epithets than in all the rest: *trickling Tear, grassie Green, etc.*

His epistles to the great contain much that is not unworthy of a place in *The Stuffed Owl*:

But who advances next, with chearful grace,
Joy in her eye, and plenty in her face?
A wheaten garland does her head adorn,
O *Property*! O goddess, *English-born*!
Where hast thou been? How did the wealthy mourn!
(*Epistle to Halifax*, ll. 13-17.)

Hail to the Shades, where WILLIAM, Great in Arms,
Retir'd from Conquest to MARIA's Charms!
Where GEORGE serene in Majesty appears,
And plans the Wonders of succeeding Years!
There, as he walks, his comprehensive Mind
Surveys the Globe, and takes in all Mankind.
(*Epistle to Craggs*, ll. 33-38.)

One's feelings towards the epithet in the last line of the following quotation from the poem *To the Memory of the late Earl of Halifax* will depend on one's feelings towards the funerary monuments of the age :

Weeping o'er thy sacred urn,
Ever shall the muses mourn ;
Sadly shall their numbers flow,
Ever elegant in woe.

The short-line poems addressed to the Carteret and Pulteney infants deserved, on the whole, the parodies they provoked.

Indeed, the only possible criticism that may be advanced against this book is that Miss Segar's admiration for the poet she has so excellently edited is inclined to be excessive.

J. B. LEISHMAN.

William Blake's Circle of Destiny. By M. O. PERCIVAL.

Pp. viii+334. New York : Columbia University Press ;
London : H. Milford. 1938. Pp. xii+334. 17s. 6d. net.

THE author of this study seeks to refute the popular belief that Blake "whose abhorrence of the indefinite was so great that he made it a cornerstone of his philosophy, . . . who hated nothing so much as a polypus of incoherent roots, had become entangled in such a polypus himself." With this object in view he surveys the Prophetic Books as a whole with respect to characters, setting, contraries, symbolism—sexual, astrological, and alchemical—mystical theology and nature, an analysis which leads him to the conviction that, far from being entangled in a polypus of his own creating, Blake had "a system as logical and coherent as any of the metaphysical systems formulated by the poets."

The wealth of carefully sifted evidence and the form in which Mr. Percival presents it go far to substantiate his case ; if, as he infers, Blake had such a system, within these pages it is rendered as lucid and coherent as it is ever likely to be and distinctly more so than in the Prophetic Books themselves. For this reason alone Mr. Percival's study deserves the careful attention of all readers interested in the longer and more obscure of Blake's writings, who will find many difficulties clarified and seeming inconsistencies reconciled. Analysis rather than evaluation being the purpose of the book, in reading it we are enabled to study Blake's metaphysic under its

different aspects from first-hand evidence, without the distraction of extraneous comment upon sources and analogues, which is admitted only as occasional illustration. At the same time, both text and ensuing notes afford ample proof of the author's scholarship and intimate knowledge of mystical writers both ancient and modern.

Presented as the poet of a transitional age, "a born mystic . . . haunted by the demon of rationalism," Blake appears in a new light, which accounts for his reactions to eighteenth-century thought and æsthetics as summarized in Reynolds' *Discourses*. His insistence upon definite particulars as against vague generalization, which, paradoxically, was the basis of his antipathy to Reynolds, has at least as close an affinity with the tenets of the age of reason as with nineteenth-century transcendentalism, though his opinions upon this matter, as upon everything, are too individual and too independent to be arbitrarily related to any school. Doubtless he succeeded to his own satisfaction in imparting the distinctness and definition of "the bounding line" to his metaphysic; how far he succeeded in conveying these effects through verbal expression must depend upon each individual reader's degree of initiation into a state of visionary consciousness akin to that of the poet. The special pleading of Mr. Percival, himself an initiate in this sense, is justified and valuable even if it serves merely as an approach to the writings of an "intellectual" mystic who sought "to solve the problem [of correlating the one with the many] in a way that satisfies the mind as well as the emotions." But it must be recognized as special pleading, providing a key to the interpretation of Blake's writings as a whole rather than solutions to the many difficulties presented by individual works. The index of Sloss and Waller to the Oxford Edition of the Prophetic Books indicates inconsistencies in symbolical characterization—for instance, in the person of Los—and changes in outlook or interpretation hard to reconcile with Mr. Percival's ordered and coherent synthesis.

The book is admirably produced and illustrated by reproductions, particularly from Blake's *Book of Job*. As it is at least arguable that Blake's drawings convey the impression of definite particularization at which he aimed more successfully than his Prophetic Writings, more extensive commentary on the former might profitably have been included.

B. E. C. DAVIS.

The Marlay Letters : 1778-1820. Edited by R. WARWICK BOND. London : Constable & Co., Ltd. 1937. Pp. xxiv+476. 21s. net.

THE continuous association of a family with one property for a century or more is sure to produce at least one generation in which letters, accounts, and other documents are carefully preserved. The collection now under review was assembled for the most part by the Countess of Charleville, whose husband was an Irish peer (the United Kingdom peerage to which he aspired always eluded him); her grandson, the late C. B. Marlay, bequeathed her papers to Professor Warwick Bond in order that he might publish such as he thought fit. This was in 1912, and the present volume is the fruit of twenty-five years' labour during which patient research has identified most of the many persons named and elucidated numerous events and allusions mentioned in papers which cover the period 1778 to 1820.

These documents all concern an exalted social circle, charming as well-bred Irish people can be; there are no scamps, nobody even loses temper except the Viceroy, the fourth Duke of Richmond, who quarrels with his ill-tempered wife on all occasions. There is, though, nothing in the least Irish about the letters—Richard Edgeworth appears as an acquaintance, but the native atmosphere of his daughter's books catches no echo in the semi-literary, semi-political circles of Charleville Castle. Unimportant notes from Shelley, when a boy, and from Byron to a formal invitation just bring us into touch with the truly great, but for the most part we depend upon writers of the second rank—Lydia White, Mrs. Opie, and Lady Morgan, the last writing long and lively letters from the Continent in 1818.

Lady Charleville was born a Dawson of Armagh, and was twice married, first to James Tisdall and secondly to C. W. Bury, created Baron Tullamoore and eventually Earl of Charleville; he was a dilettante kind of person and made quite a good translation of *La Pucelle*, in which bibliographers to this day believe that his wife had a considerable share; the editor discusses her participation in it, and seems to think she assisted in some way, although she denied it flatly. She was certainly competent to help, for she had been educated in France, and many of her letters to her Tisdall son are written in not-very-good French; Professor Bond is not one

to miss any literary allusion, and he does not suggest it, but one may guess that she had accepted Mme. de Sévigné as a model, as the following conclusion of a letter to her son suggests :

Mon cher et très cher, aimez moi un peu et comptez que votre bonheur et votre prospérité est le premier voeu que ce coeur forme, qui n'a jamais aimé rien dans ce monde en comparaison de vous ! (p. 167).

One is left slightly uncertain whether the son, like Mme. de Grignan, was worthy of all the devotion lavished on him ; his mother certainly gave him very sound advice when he went up to Oxford (Christ Church) :

Knowledge of things can only be had from books, and a dunce produces a bad impression even on a world mainly frivolous, since there are always some who know better.

One infers that Mr. Tisdall was not a very serious student, but when he makes a European tour we are given a journal which, as the editor says, "evinces a degree of taste and width of interest we should hardly have expected." He shows an occasional vein of ironic humour, thus when travelling from Amsterdam to Antwerp he has to cross three ferries and is

dragged through roads in the most desperate boggy state and more than once threatening to set us fast, about 20 miles to Breda, where we got in eight hours and immediately sent tennence to y^e Church for a Te Deum on our arrival.

The last chapter deals with the Morgans' tours in France and Italy in 1819-1820, and makes a valuable supplement to Lady Morgan's *Diary* published in 1859.

Throughout the book one is in excellent company, constantly meeting with people who counted in Europe ; but it does not add greatly to our previous knowledge of them, and were it not for the pious devotion of Professor Bond (whose keen eye and patient research extract every atom of interest from the slightest allusion), one might doubt whether it is really worth while to give first-class editing to material not wholly of the first class. It is, however a mine of information, and well-made pedigrees explain the relationship of most of the characters in the book. There is, too, an excellent index, which strangely enough omits to make an entry under Shelley's distinguished name, though two letters from him and later mention occur in the text.

GEORGE ELAND.

Shelley's Religion. By ELLSWORTH BARNARD. Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press ; London : H. Milford. 1937. Pp. xii+320. \$3.50 ; 16s. net.

MR. BARNARD approaches his subject in the manner of Cotta, who says that he cannot so easily perceive why a proposition is true as why it is false, and that it is easier for him to attack the opinions of others than to formulate his own. In this spirit the author acknowledges a real indebtedness to "those critics who are so often referred to hereafter as 'Shelley's detractors,'" principally because they provide "a contrast which cannot but add definiteness and lucidity to the presentation of my own opinions." A torch, it is true, shines most brightly amid surrounding darkness, and may illumine small objects in remote corners better than the light of day. Mr. Barnard's torch is of ample power, and has helped to "set in a new light," as Professor Warren Beach remarks on the dust-cover, "many aspects of Shelley's thought." Its disadvantage is that the light which it sheds on each aspect in turn may throw the other aspects into greater obscurity.

The contrast between light and darkness would have been suggested by Mr. Barnard's pages even if Mr. Barnard had not suggested it himself. So long as he is writing of Shelley's mind and art we feel that the range of his knowledge and his mastery of evidence deserve respect, even though we may disagree with some of his conclusions ; but when he turns from constructive criticism to history he reveals depths of ignorance surpassing anything achieved by "Shelley's detractors." Here is an example, taken from an account of "the actual state of the Christian religion in England" (pp. 41-2) :

The excesses of the French Revolution were attributed to reason and free thought, which were held up as painted devils to frighten the mob into a frenzy of reaction. To protest against the established order was treason ; to offer a rational defense of such a protest was blasphemy. The rope and the pillory were the answer to those who had the courage to assert their right to seek and speak the truth. Under such conditions, the latent tendency of Christianity toward a fatalistic acquiescence in things as they are and a belief that "Whatever is, is right" was sure to come to the surface, and there were few of the clergy who were not willing to kiss the rod with which a near-sighted and ruthless government was too ready to scourge every person who showed the desire to be a man instead of a slave.

It has remained for Mr. Barnard to discover that the clergy of Shelley's age, which was also the age of Jane Austen, groaned under oppression. Most of us have supposed that they had more freedom than was good for them and abused it by taking their duties too lightly. Mr. Barnard himself has said, a few lines earlier, that the majority took Orders in the Church "as an easy means of getting a living, in which neither industry nor intellect is particularly essential." They must have been sadly disillusioned, though we are not told so, when they found themselves kissing the rod or being scourged by a ruthless Government instead of realizing this pleasant expectation.

The statement that people who told the truth were punished with the rope or the pillory is more definite, and is worth a moment's examination. Mr. Barnard's definition of truth, whatever that may be, can hardly be broad enough to include perjury, and perjury was the only offence for which a man could be sent to the pillory after 1815.¹ What, then, of the rope? It is certain that neither George III nor his successor—nor, for that matter, Henry VIII or Elizabeth, in days of real despotism—could have put a man to death for his words unless the words had been construed by a legal tribunal as high treason. The number of convictions for high treason, therefore, affords a satisfactory test of Mr. Barnard's statement. For the years 1812 to 1820, inclusive, the statistics of "offences for which there have been Capital executions in England" are conveniently given by the *Annual Register*,² on the authority of the Home Office, and there we learn that the number of persons condemned for high treason during that period amounted to eight. The names of three of these martyrs to the truth—Brandreth, Ludlam, and Turner—will be familiar to Mr. Barnard, who in a later chapter (p. 187) speaks of "the legal murder of three poor and ignorant men on trumped-up charges of treason." That is what Shelley believed, according to his pamphlet *On the Death of the Princess Charlotte*; but anyone who will look at the case impartially will find that the suffering innocents had not only raised an armed force to make war on the Government but, in the course of their proceedings, had murdered one defenceless victim and

¹ Probably Mr. Barnard is thinking of the case of Daniel Eaton, the publisher of Paine's *Age of Reason*, who was sentenced to the pillory in 1812. That case is misleading, as it was the rarity of the punishment which helped to make the affair sensational. In practice the pillory had been falling into disuse for many years.

² Vol. for 1820, pp. 642-3.

boasted that they were going to murder others. There is no civilized country, even to-day, where people would be allowed to tell the truth in that manner with impunity. The five needed to complete the total were, obviously, Thistleton and his four confederates of the Cato Street conspiracy, who, like their predecessors, had plotted murder, though on a more magnificent scale, as an incident to rebellion. By this time, if it was a crime to tell the truth, Shelley's turn for the rope or the pillory must have been long overdue, and we are not told how he managed to escape. Perhaps the pamphlet *On the Death of the Princess Charlotte*, which contains many questionable statements, was found to satisfy the legal standard of mendacity.

In a later chapter Mr. Barnard distinguishes, justly, between natural law and "what men have agreed to call laws," and argues that Shelley's opposition to certain enactments was compatible with a profound respect for law as an expression of the moral sense. He prepares to apply the generalization by asking (p. 242), "What were the laws against which Shelley rebelled?" and the answer leads to another of his spectacular excursions into history. The first is "the law that made it a crime to speak one's belief in regard to religion." We are not told where to look for such a law, and Mr. Barnard will not find it if he should search the Statute Book for the rest of his life. The activities of Shelley himself, and of a host of lesser agnostics, bear witness to its absence; so, in their different ways, do the latitudinarian clergy, the army of Methodist preachers, the goodly company of Quakers, and the prophets of Catholic Emancipation.

The next on the list, "the law that made it treason to protest against the tyranny of a brutal government," though not correctly described, has a little more substance. It is true that the Seditious Meetings Act of 1817 was sometimes enforced with excessive zeal by the local magistrates, and once, at Peterloo, with murderous violence. The populace believed that the complication of evils really due to the war and the Industrial Revolution could be cured by Parliamentary Reform, and the governing powers, with equal or greater folly, believed that Parliamentary Reform would lead to anarchy. The contest was not between the people and an irresponsible despot, as Mr. Barnard seems to suppose, but between the people and the unreformed Parliament. The King, in Shelley's time, was hardly more than a passive spectator; though William IV,

at a later stage, hastened the inevitable end of the struggle by throwing the weight of his influence on to the popular side.

This brings us to "the law that taxed the starving poor in order to give millions of pounds to a royal blackguard." No such law ever existed. In the absence of evidence we must refuse to believe that George IV¹ ever possessed millions of pounds, or even one million that he could call personally his own. In any case he could not have touched a penny of the taxpayers' money except by the voluntary act of the House of Commons, and the House of Commons, though generally subservient to the Government in vital matters, was always thrown into one of its critical moods when the Civil List came up for discussion. That imaginary law need detain us no longer. The fourth and last, "the law that made woman the property of man, and chained together the bodies of those in whose hearts affection had long been dead," is also imaginary. The only rational ground of Mr. Barnard's protest is the absence of a law permitting unrestricted divorce, which is not generally thought to be a sign of national degradation.

It is impossible to enter into further detail of "the brutal and senseless oppression to which," according to the author, "the English people were subjected" (p. 117). Shelley himself, writing to Peacock on May 15, 1816, has answered the indictment in general terms:

You live in a free country, where you may act without restraint, and possess that which you possess in security; and so long as the name of country and the selfish conceptions it includes shall persist, England, I am persuaded, is the most free and the most refined. . . .

So long as man is such as he now is, the experience of which I speak will never teach him to despise the country of his birth—far otherwise, like Wordsworth, he will never know what love subsists between that and him until absence shall have made its beauty more heartfelt; our poets and our philosophers, our mountains and our lakes, the rural lanes and fields which are so especially our own, are ties which, until I become utterly senseless, can never be broken asunder.

Or, in the words of an earlier poet, "England, with all thy faults I love thee still."

It is fair to say again that Mr. Barnard's history is not his strong point. His knowledge of Shelley's writings is full and accurate

¹ I assume as the lesser of two improbabilities that the "royal blackguard" is George IV rather than his stolidly conscientious predecessor, who reigned during the greater part of Shelley's lifetime.

and he consistently quotes his authority for every statement of fact. There is no need to speak of the value of his interpretation, for the author himself tells us in his Introduction that "it is the most thorough treatment which Shelley's religious ideas have ever received," and that, if not exhaustive, "it comes nearer to being so than any work with which I am familiar." One would have thought that the publishers had mustered enough volunteers to blow that trumpet.

Throughout many pages, especially in the chapter on *Prometheus Bound*, Mr. Barnard contends that Shelley abandoned, after the period of *Queen Mab*, his earlier faith in the doctrine of Necessity. Two lines quoted from *Alastor* (p. 67), where the poet claims it as a merit that

no bright bird, insect, or gentle beast
I consciously have injured,

are certainly inconsistent with that doctrine if, as the writer insists, we are to take them quite literally. Assuming this side of the case to have been proved, "What is the significance," asks the author (p. 62), "of Shelley's insistence on the right and the necessity of private judgment? Simply this: that if Shelley says (as he does) that there is some spiritual Power at work in the universe, and if he attributes to that Power (as he does) goodness and beauty and love, then it can be fairly asserted that he believes in a personal God."

It is tacitly assumed throughout that the doctrine of Necessity is an obstacle which must be removed before Shelley's faith in a personal God can be established. That would not have been admitted by the Necessarians of Shelley's age, or, for that matter, by the Stoics. Necessity, though an operative cause, is not a First Cause, and unless, like Shelley in the *Refutation of Deism*, we give up the problem as insoluble within the bounds of human reason, we cannot acknowledge the law without admitting the conception of a legislator. Mr. Barnard himself, in language which Hartley or Priestley would have approved, contends that "if the will is absolutely free, the world of man is reduced to a chaos ruled by chance," and that "such a supposition is an outrage upon human nature and common sense" (p. 144). At the same time, he will not have Shelley "condemned as a Necessarian." His own conviction is that Shelley's faith "clearly passes over, not into blind fatalism or scientific determinism, but into the Christian conception of

Providence" (p. 145). Priestley would have answered that this is merely substituting a theological term for its philosophical equivalent. "The man", he says,

who believes that the government of the world is in the hands of God . . . cannot believe that any thing happens unknown to him, or unforeseen by him. . . . Consequently, a person who sees in a strong light the doctrine of divine providence, cannot avoid speaking like a necessarian on the subject, and considering God himself as having *done* what he *permits*, and *avails himself* of, in the good that results from it.¹

It is by the *Essay on Christianity* that the writer's thesis must stand or fall. "This essay," says Mr. Barnard, "contains Shelley's latest reasoned statements concerning the nature of God: statements which sweep into the discard" some earlier pronouncements, and "fully establish Shelley's belief in a God that may legitimately be called personal" (p. 67). It is unnecessary to follow the argument, because at a much later stage (p. 228) Mr. Barnard modifies his contention, remarking that "the very conception of personality involves limitation, separateness, exclusiveness," and that "an absolutely good or perfect Being can scarcely be thought of (so far as it can be thought of at all) as a person." The difficulty would not have appeared if Mr. Barnard had reverted to his former description of Shelley's God as a spiritual Power having the attributes of goodness, beauty, and love. Such a Being must be conscious of his own existence, and that is all that is essential to the conception of a person.

However he may waver on this point, Mr. Barnard maintains consistently that Shelley believed in a spiritual Power. The passage to which he attaches the greatest importance, in the earlier discussion (p. 69), is a single sentence summarizing the view which Shelley makes his own:

He [Christ] affirms that a being of pure and gentle habits will not fail, in every thought, in every object of every thought, to be aware of benignant visitings from the invisible energies by which he is surrounded.

Wordsworth expresses the same idea in *Tintern Abbey* when he speaks of

A motion and a spirit that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
And rolls through all things,

¹ *The Doctrine of Philosophical Necessity Illustrated* (1777), p. 130.

and his doctrine is usually described as Pantheistic. Mr. Barnard will not allow that Shelley was a Pantheist, and dismisses with an exclamation mark a critic "who can speak of 'the pantheistic *Essay on Christianity*'!" (p. 70, *note*). He adds, however, that he has no wish to quarrel about mere words, and that, if he has made his meaning clear, "the reader may describe it in any terms that he likes." It is not merely a rhetorical answer to point out that Mr. Barnard has just said, on the same page, that those who contend for Shelley's belief in an impersonal God "ought at least to define their terms," and to remind him that he is himself under a similar obligation. The lack of definition is a weakness which is noticeable at every critical point of the book, and is not compensated by the noisy denunciation of "armchair critics", "Victorian smugness", "those comfortable persons who patronize Shelley", and "the sheer stupidity or misapplied ingenuity which in every age manages to pass itself off as literary criticism."

Mr. Barnard tells us more than once that Shelley did not believe in personal immortality; and as he has, apparently, an open mind on the subject of Pantheism it may seem doubtful, so far, whether he has justified the title of the book. In the closing chapters, however, "Shelley's religion" takes a new and unexpected form. It appears that the Spirit of Good or Spirit of Beauty, which is manifest in Love according to the *Essay on Christianity*, is revealed by Imagination according to the *Defence of Poetry*. The two essays are thus brought into harmony. Shelley's "genuine belief seems to be that Imagination literally is 'the immortal God': the Deity, the divine Spirit of Good, as it makes itself known within the nature of man" (p. 255). Presumably the same might be said of Love, the other of the "two different elements in the one Divine Nature" (p. 273); but Imagination, which is always accorded the dignity of a capital letter, receives greater attention because its claim to the place assigned to it is less obvious.

Here again we feel the need of definition. The reader of the *Defence of Poetry* will find that the word *imagination* is used in at least two different senses. At one time it denotes the creative power which distinguishes poetry, τὸ ποιεῖν, from reason, τὸ λογίζειν;¹ at another it conveys the idea of prophetic inspiration, the equivalent of πνεῦμα if we must express it in Greek. When

¹ The word, of course, is Shelley's; but the active form is unusual, and the true meaning is to calculate rather than to reason in the higher sense.

Shelley speaks of poets in the conclusion as "the hierophants of an unapprehended inspiration; . . . the trumpets which sing to battle and feel not what they inspire; the influence which is moved not, but moves," he leaves us in no doubt of his meaning; but the meaning so conveyed is clearly inconsistent with the earlier statement that poetry is "the expression of the imagination." The perfect living symbol of all poets, according to Shelley's final paragraph, would be Moses at the foot of Mount Sinai; but we should certainly be misunderstood if we said that Moses devised the Ten Commandments by the exercise of his imagination. Mr. Barnard does not remove the difficulty, but rather accentuates it, by repeating the sense of selected passages with greater emphasis. He tells us in one place that "Imagination is a *creative* power" (p. 258), and frequently elsewhere that it is the channel by which the Spirit of Good, the object of Shelley's worship, communicates with the mind of man. Both statements are authorized by the *Defence of Poetry*, but we are entitled to expect that Shelley's interpreter should make some attempt to reconcile them. The doctrine expounded by Mr. Barnard would lead the poet to worship himself, because the creative imagination is only one faculty of the mind and the whole must be greater than its part.

It is unlikely that any study of Shelley will attain finality, as genius will always make different impressions on different minds; but it is not on that general ground alone that certain claims to finality, discernible in Mr. Barnard's concluding chapter as well as in his Introduction, must be denied. Judged by its intention to be provocative the book is a great success.

P. L. CARVER.

Mary Shelley. A Biography. By R. GLYNN GRYLLE. London and New York: Oxford University Press. 1938. Pp. xvi + 345. 18s. net.

IN her introduction to this biography Miss Grylls divides "all human relationship and all living into the Noumenal and the Phenomenal." The latter division consists, she finds, of whatever is trivial; the former "touches reality, and registers a moment in eternity." It is to the first class of relationship that she assigns the life of Shelley and Mary Godwin. Shelley himself, we may conjec-

ture, might have been a little impatient of this terminology, if we may judge from what he says in *Peter Bell* :

The Devil then sent to Leipsic fair
For Born's translation of Kant's book ;
A world of words, tail foremost, where
Right—wrong—false—true—and foul—and fair
As in a lottery-wheel are shook.
Five thousand crammed octavo pages
Of German psychologies . . .

But, however this may be, the point to be deplored about Miss Grylls's volume is that there is so little of the Noumenal, so very much of the Phenomenal. And the Phenomenal itself is often such very poor stuff, or at least so very "trivial." In fact, the book descends at the end to a most banal chronicle of the doings of Sir Percy Florence Shelley—a kindly and estimable man, no doubt ; but what are we to make of pages like this ?—

November 24th, 1876. . . . Dined at the Friths. Calderon, Rhoda Broughton Burnand were there.

This is, indeed, to fall from the region of the "sun-treader."

Perhaps the object of the authoress is to do justice to the human and domestic characteristics of Mary Shelley. But she has become involved in a tangle of feminine tittle-tattle. It is a book that is like the conversation of old women knitting. The kettle sings on the hob and the child's bath is prepared by the hearth. In vain we sigh for the fresh air of the meadows of asphodel, or the high pure glades where the Muses tread. It may be good enough for Mary ; it may present one side of her nature. But it is very far from a truthful picture of Shelley.

Ah, did you once see Shelley plain ?
How poor it seems and flat !

we are tempted to cry.

With all this, the book is so very meticulously documented. The fashion of literary criticism being what it is, this may be expected. We have no right to complain nowadays that the "sacred poets are swamped with themselves." We must tolerate letters each compiled from this source or from that, the various sentences ticketed with a letter in a footnote to indicate the provenance, even though the matter be infinitely unimportant. Miss Grylls also is to be allowed her quotations from Mr. Day Lewis and Mr. Louis MacNeice and Su Tung-p'o, however alien or irrelevant. They

reveal her acquaintance with the literature of the hour, and they too are carefully documented. But what shall we say when there is a footnote to explain that

Then felt I like some watcher of the skies

is from the sonnet "On first looking into Chapman's Homer"?

This is the more to be deplored because Miss Grylls's biography contains much that is new and valuable—notably Appendix C, which gives ten unpublished letters, including Coleridge to Godwin, Shelley to Hogg, Mary Shelley to John Murray. And we have a multitude of minor rectifications. But the whole is so interpenetrated with an air of nothingness and futility that the effect is nullity. Dr. Johnson's sturdy remark, "To adjust the minute events of literary history, is tedious and troublesome; it requires indeed no great force of understanding," is more independent than subtle. But on the occasions on which Moore and Trelawny speak in this biography, we are transported to a larger and more virile mode. Miss Grylls has too much of the anise and cummin, and too little of the Tables of the Law.

And herein lies the root of the complaint. In no place has Miss Grylls faced up to the moral issue that lies in the separation of Shelley from Harriet and Mary's responsibility. It may be argued that this is a question long decided. But, if so, the Noumenal relation of Shelley and Mary should not be named. It may be said that Mary Godwin was sixteen and Shelley nineteen, and moral responsibility is not expected of children. Again, the argument may be advanced that both Shelley and Mary were disciples of the Godwinian philosophy. If so, it must be answered that Shelley would have done well to follow Hume and reflect, when he sat down to backgammon, how ridiculous a thing was philosophy. Yet again we may take the view of Charles Armitage Brown: "She (*i.e.* Harriet) however turned all his visionary schemes to air. After a time, her conduct was such that her infidelities were scarcely the worst part, so that he could not live with her." But every biographer of Mary Godwin, no less than of Shelley, must meet the question. It is vital to an estimate of Shelley the man, and either stains, or does not, the white radiance of his poetry. And it is no less vital to an estimate of Mary. But Miss Grylls has shirked the dilemma.

The printing and format of this book are admirable. But the Index is by no means satisfactory. First, the pagination under the

sub-headings very often has nothing to do with the sub-headings; e.g. "Clairmont, Charles, expedition on Thames, 51, 83, 117." Here pp. 83, 117 have no reference to the Thames. And so frequently. Again, "Lord Eldon 81 n. 2" should be 81 n. 1; A Fairy Tale 254=254 n. 2; Claire Clairmont 248=247; plans to go to Vienna 161=162; death of Allegra 163=162. There is not space to work through the Index in this way. But it is imperfect and might be rectified; as it impairs the value of a beautifully printed book.

T. E. CASSON.

Letters of Fanny Brawne to Fanny Keats (1820-1824).

Edited with a biographical introduction by F. EDGCUMBE. With a Foreword by MAURICE FORMAN. London: Oxford University Press. 1936. Pp. xxviii+77. 10s. 6d.

Life of John Keats. By CHARLES ARMITAGE BROWN. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by DOROTHY H. BODURTHA and W. B. POPE. London: Oxford University Press. 1936. Pp. viii+129. 6s. net.

Some Letters and Miscellanea of Charles Brown, The friend of John Keats and Thomas Richards. Edited by MAURICE BUXTON FORMAN. London: Oxford University Press. 1937. Pp. xiv+146. 7s. 6d. net.

THESE volumes are of varying degrees of value and interest, even to the student of Keats. Charles Armitage Brown's *Life* is a work of first rate importance. It has not been published before, but supplied essential materials to Monckton Milnes and Colvin in their biographies. It is brief, but it is gracefully and poignantly written, with something of the vigour and racy fitness of Hazlitt. It is Brown's contribution to the fame of his friend, for which he began to put together materials immediately after Keats's death, but of which he deferred completion and publication for twenty years, owing (he says) to the emotional intensity of re-living through Keats's illness. He left the volume unfinished in 1841, when he sailed for New Zealand; and handed over his MSS. to Milnes.

Brown's *Life* has, however, the freshness and emotion of the man who knew and nursed Keats during his illness in England and had previously walked with him in the Highlands. It has the dew of the dawn of friendship upon it and the rainbow hues of hope which

were too soon to fade from the poet's heaven. To read it is to breathe, in some degree, the atmosphere of Keats's early poems. The biography is thus, as it were, the counterpart of Hogg's life of Shelley, though Brown is closer to Keats than Shelley to his friend. Though incomplete and slight in structure, it should be one of the missals and reliquaries of the lover of Keats, every word written in tincts of gold. The account of the last hours of Keats, and his death, reaches a point of poignancy not exceeded in the annals of literature.

The editors have done their work with efficiency and thoroughness. It is difficult, however, to agree with them that Brown's biography is impaired in value by his belief that Keats's death was caused by the malignity of the reviewers. They state that Brown declines from a comprehensive portrait upon sheer invective. That Brown's study is in part objurgation no more impairs its artistic quality, however, than is *Adonais* vitiated by the winged iambs of the "Preface" and the relative stanzas. The *sæva indignatio*, in fact, and the sacred horror constitute the character of the book, and give it a Sybilline wrath. It is, in truth, a poem; and the Furies attend it.

The *Letters and Miscellanea* of Charles Brown are of varying quality, and nothing in them comes up to the fragment of Keats's Life. The letters reveal a man of amiable and serene character, with a strong affection for his son; and contain descriptions of his visits to the monasteries of Vallombrosa, Camaldoli, and La Verna, which were afterwards worked up into articles for the *New Monthly Magazine*. These narratives are reprinted later in this volume. They are light and pleasant, a little in the manner of Shelley's letters to Peacock, but much below the charm and scholarship of that master. Brown has one good couplet in parody:

Ah, me! what perils do environ
The man who meddles with Lord Byron.

His short study or story, "*La Bella Tabaccaia*" is graceful and slightly reminiscent of Boccaccio. The most interesting thing in the book, however, from the literary standpoint, is the translation of the 1st canto of *Orlando Innamorato* from Berni. The versification is at least as good as Rose's *Ariosto*. It were devoutly to be wished that there had been some classic translation of Boiardo in English. This book is beautifully produced, with a handsome frontispiece.

The *Letters of Fanny Brawne to Fanny Keats* are a bitter-sweet. Regard for the memory of Keats forbids us to dip the pen in that gall which that trivial, light-hearted, gaudy butterfly deserves. Or rather perhaps she deserves it not. It has been the young lady's misfortune to be dragged by Destiny into contact with one of the great tragic English poets. A kinder lot would have left her to plan the sleeves and crêpe lisse of Fanny Keats's dresses and to find mates for her own pigeons. As Charles II said of Prince George of Denmark, "There is nothing in him," so there was nothing in Fanny Brawne. The editor remarks that she was a "young woman . . . possessing an unusual critical faculty, and intellectually fitted to become the wife of Keats." This is nonsense. Of course, she was only twenty and had not had the advantage of reading the school of English. But the best thing that can be said of her is that her letters are rather like Miss Austen's heroines—highly amusing (at her own expense), frivolous, and without stops. No doubt, she had affinities to Keats on one side of his nature. But apart from Keats, her letters were not worth publishing or annotating. The edition is well enough in its get-up, but rather expensive.

T. E. CASSON.

Geschichte der Englischen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. Von WALTER F. SCHIRMER. Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag. 1937. Pp. 679.

THIS history of English literature is clear in conception and method, well-balanced in its handling of material, and the reliability of its author's literary appreciation is beyond any comment. It may be considered as the German counterpart of Compton-Rickett's *History*, being written, however, in a more impersonal manner, giving neither quotations nor biographies, and displaying a graceful stateliness of style, a classical soundness of judgment, and a firm hold of essentials that go far to make up for any want of that relaxation from intellectual tension which the reader may perhaps feel the need of at times.

The chapters about mediæval, Renaissance, and "baroque" literature are particularly valuable. It is surely an amazing feat of historical writing to condense such a mass of relevant information of a political, social, religious, and literary nature into a text that reads everywhere easily, is never turgid, and is elegant yet sober.

The book avoids the two pitfalls which endanger work of this kind on both sides of the Channel: it is as far from journalistic essayism as it is from the heaviness of learned dissertation. The analysis of Elizabethan drama or the chapter on Milton are models of a treatment that combines large perspective with great command of detail. But it is awkward to name any single part for commendation; the whole book is evenly praiseworthy and has all the qualities one might hope for in a manual of literary history written at the present day.

The English student will value this work mainly as a picture of the nation's literature drawn by an observer with a peculiar gift for portraying not so much "movements" and "tendencies" (which is rather the province of the French literary historians) as deep and intensive views of dominant epochs, and with a synthetic faculty that succeeds in relating the significance of any given school—or, for that matter, of any characteristic single work—to its philosophical and cultural background. In this respect the only qualification which one must make concerns the very last few pages which are devoted to twentieth-century poetry and fiction. There we feel the absence of a uniform criterion, a certain inconclusiveness which is all the more striking as it is unusual in this book. This may be simply the result of a corresponding lack of unity in the *Zeitgeist* itself. But it may also be an effect of a slightly distorted vision caused by the closeness of the object before the eye or, perhaps, by a defect in the eye itself. It is, however, less any biased judgment we are complaining of than the abstention from judgment, the refusal to acknowledge and to call by its name the new spirit that is asserting itself in the better part of contemporary English literature.

An appendix containing sixty pages of selected and briefly reasoned bibliography makes the book useful for reference in special research.

H. W. HÄUSERMANN

A Dictionary of American English on Historical Principles.

Ed. Sir WILLIAM CRAIGIE and JAMES R. HULBERT. Part I, A—BAGGAGE. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; London: Oxford University Press. 1936. Pp. xli+116. 17s. net each part.

A WARM welcome must be extended to the first part of this new dictionary "which endeavours to exhibit clearly those features by

which the English of the American colonies and the United States is distinguished from that of England and the rest of the English-speaking world and at the same time includes not only words or phrases which are clearly or apparently of American origin, or have greater currency here than elsewhere, but also every word denoting something which has a real connection with the development of the country and the history of its people." From this double purpose arises on the one hand the full discussion of such American phrases as *aside from*, *at the east* (for *in the east*), *all aboard*, *all sorts of* and *all-fired*, or such colloquial Americanisms as *ahere*, *ahold* (*aholt*), *anigh*, *ary* (*any*), and on the other, eleven columns dealing with compounds of "American," from *American aloe* to *American yew*. The article on *alowife*, a fish found in great numbers on the Atlantic coast, extends to 58 lines as compared with 18 in the *O.E.D.* There are a good many words of Spanish origin, such as *adios*, *aguardiente*, *aparego*, *azotea*, *ayuntamiento*, and a certain number of Indian ones such as *apishamore*. Religious sects play a fairly prominent part, as in *adventist*, *adventism*, *albright*, *anxious bench*, *anxious seat*.

Specifically American developments of common words may be noted: *alumnus*, for which 9 lines sufficed in the *O.E.D.* and 25 in the Supplement to the *O.E.D.*, takes 54 lines, and *alumna* appears for the first time, taking 11 lines; *accession*, now so commonly used for an addition to a library, seems to be of American origin as is the form *ad* for advertisement. Typical of American humour are *ambulance-chaser*, "a lawyer who incites persons to sue for damages because of accident," *come to the acorns*, "experience adversity," and *apple-bee*, "social gathering for preparing apples for drying," *almighty dollar*, which Irving claimed as his own invention, seems to have been a phrase already coined before he used it in his *Creole Village*.

It is interesting to note that a good many of the words and usages not found in the *O.E.D.* had already found their way into the Supplement to that Dictionary, illustrating the close association between the English of this country and of the States.

The dictionary is a piece of extraordinary clear arrangement and printing, and the editors and the Oxford Press alike are to be congratulated on the result of their labours.

A. MAWER.

Essays by Divers Hands. Being the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature of the United Kingdom. New Series, Vol. XVI. Edited by G. P. GOOCH. London: Oxford University Press. 1937. Pp. viii + 155. 7s. net.

WHATEVER success may have attended these lectures when delivered orally, as a whole they do not furnish a particularly readable book. A welcome exception is Mr. H. A. Vachell's pleasantly discursive paper on "Technique of Novels and Plays," summarily analysed and illustrated with respect to style, story, originality, imagination, credibility, characterization, balance, wit and humour, tension, and charm. By comparison Mr. A. E. W. Mason's lecture on "Story-Telling" is disappointing, the lecturer confining himself to commonplace generalizations concerning the necessity of action, the dangers of diffuseness, vitality in characterization, and so forth. Two of the lectures—"Pirates and their Books," by Dr. Philip Gosse, and "Anglo-Indian Verse," by Sir Henry Sharp—suffer through the intrusion of excessive historical details, which hamper the former in his pursuit of a stimulating subject and may account for the latter's inadequate treatment of Kipling. The intrinsic value of Chatterton's poetry, the range of his genius and influence as distinct from the romantic interest attached to his career and catastrophe, provide Mr. E. H. W. Meyerstein with material for an appreciative study entitled "Chatterton: his Significance To-day." The subject chosen by Professor Edith J. Morley—"Eighteenth-Century Ideals in Life and Literature"—is far too wide and indefinite to allow more than superficial treatment. The closing lecture, by the late Mr. John Drinkwater, on "Art and Nationality" is perhaps best dismissed with the words of the editor, Dr. Gooch, as "not one of his best literary efforts."

B. E. C. DAVIS.

SHORT NOTICES

A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue. By Sir WILLIAM A. CRAIGIE. Part VII, COW-CYTHARISTE. (Completing Vol. I, A to C.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press; London: H. Milford. 1937. Pp. 721-837. 21s. net.

The seventh part of this new dictionary appears with more than usual promptness and completes the first volume of this great undertaking. It contains an exceptionally large number of words not recorded or only imperfectly recorded in the *O.E.D.*, most of them either of Gaelic or French origin and generally of a highly technical character. Among the former we may note *cro(y)*, "sheepfold," *cudd(e)ich*, "night's entertainment due from a tenant to his lord," and *cumerlach*, "fugitive serf belonging to a monastery." Among the latter we have *coupe-darier*, "blow from behind"; *coyon*, "coward, poltroon"; *crayer*, *crair*, "small trading vessel"; and *currou*, "watcher, ranger of a forest." Interesting compounds are *coupstay*, "market-town," a Shetland word from O.N. *kaup-staðr*; *craftschilder*, "young craftsmen,"; *crag-leif*, "leave to dig coal from a heugh." *Culenar*, "man from Cologne" (1487), is a relic of Scottish trade with Cologne; *cowclink*, "courtesan," is a good example of Dunbar's ready coining of terms of abuse. There is a lengthy list of additions and corrections—mainly additions—and an exceedingly useful Index of variant spellings which will enable readers readily to look up all the forms and uses of a given word, thus meeting a difficulty raised in the reviews of an earlier section, viz. the difficult breaking up of a word under different headings, according to the form.

A. M.

Shakespeare's Philosophical Patterns. By W. CLYDE CURRY. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1937. Pp. xii+244. \$2.75.

Mr. Curry's thesis in this book is not, of course, that Shakespeare was a systematic philosopher expressing a closely reasoned theory of life, but that in *Macbeth* and *The Tempest* at least he reveals "a comfortable and accurate knowledge of the basic principles supporting the two systems" of scholasticism and neo-Platonism respectively, and that this knowledge determined the "patterns" of the two plays. Thus it follows that in *Macbeth* Shakespeare "appropriately employed witch-figures as dramatic symbols, but the Weird Sisters are in reality demons, actual representatives of the world of darkness opposed to good"; Lady Macbeth is literally "possessed" by the spirits she summoned to unsex her, and "Macbeth's spiritual experience is a representation on the stage of the traditional Christian conception of a human soul on its way to the Devil." In *The Tempest* Sycorax is a devotee of the goety and Prospero of the theurgy postulated by the neo-Platonic philosophers.

Very few readers will be convinced of the truth of these conclusions, in spite of Mr. Curry's learned and sympathetic account of the two philosophical traditions. One cannot help insisting that *Macbeth* is not another *Dr. Faustus* and that neo-Platonism can no more explain away Ariel and Caliban than folk-lore can pigeon-hole Oberon and Titania. The most interesting part of the book is Chapter 2, which is really an extended footnote on *Macbeth*, IV, i, 56-65. Even here, however, one feels uncertain as to the extent of Shakespeare's knowledge of the philosophical tradition behind the passage, which is perhaps most likely to have had its origin in a sentence or paragraph, as yet unnoticed, in some book he had been reading.

R. C. BALD.

Plays about the Theatre in England from "The Rehearsal" in 1671 to the Licensing Act in 1737. By DANE F. SMITH. London and New York: Oxford University Press. 1937. Pp. xxiv+287. \$4.00.

The attractive format and lively illustrations of this book create a favourable first impression that its text does not altogether sustain. In succession seventy plays, which contain criticisms and comments on the Restoration and early seventeenth-century stage, are discussed and summarized, with extensive quotations. But there is little else, and the plays have been so effectively isolated not only from their background but from one another that the book cannot be said even to present an adequate picture of the theatre of the time as seen through the spectacles of burlesque. Thus it will be useful mainly as a short cut for those who wish to know something about the plays discussed without having to go too deeply into the matter for themselves.

This is a pity, for the book could not have been written without considerable industry and enthusiasm. Mr. Smith has gone down more than one previously unexplored byway, and, in spite of various pretentious but superfluous footnotes and a veritable peppering of unnecessary *sic's* in his quotations, he has a capacity for learning and research. Sometimes, too, as in his comments on Gay's *What D'Ye Call It* and in his concluding pages, there are signs of real critical acumen. All one can do is to express the fairly confident belief that next time Mr. Smith will give us something better.

R. C. BALD.

Countries of the Mind. First and Second Series. By JOHN MIDDLETON MURRY. London: Oxford University Press. 6s. net.

Mr. Murry's two well-known collections of critical essays have now been reprinted in one volume in the Oxford Bookshelf series.

Charlotte Ramsay Lennox. An Eighteenth-century Lady of Letters. By MIRIAM R. SMALL. (Yale Studies in English, vol. 85.) New Haven: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford. 1935. Pp. viii+268. 11s. 6d. net.

Professor Small has given us the first detailed account of the life and works of Charlotte Lennox. She is known to us as Johnson's friend and the author of *The Female Quixote*. Little is known of her non-literary career. Professor Small pieces together a story of domestic disappointments, of a continuous struggle against poverty right up to her death, when she was "buried with the common soldiery . . . undistinguished even by a headstone. . . ." She had long been a beneficiary of the Royal Literary Fund, and Professor Small has been courteously enabled to give the details of this connection. It was a life of great industry, during which she produced a vast amount of miscellaneous work for the publishers. Throughout it all she was sustained and inspired by the friendship of Johnson, who never doubted her superiority among the bluestockings. He suggested some of her most interesting works, including *Shakespeare Illustrated*. It is an example of her spirit that for this work she set to and learned Italian from Baretti. Baretti wrote her an ode in Italian, and mentioned Johnson as a poet weighing "for a moment in the balance of his judgment every one of his own lines."

Professor Small analyses her writings, particularly the popular *Female Quixote* and the various imitations that followed. She notes that Jane Austen reread it and may well have derived the idea of *Northanger Abbey* from it.

The appendices include a bibliography of her works (13 pp.), an able discussion of the works doubtfully attributed to her, and a list of references to her in periodicals.

A. TILOTON.

Johnsonian Gleanings. By ALEYN LYELL READE. Part VII. The Jervis, Porter, and other allied families. Privately printed for the author. 1935. Pp. vi+226. 21s. to subscribers.

Mr. Reade's volumes continue to appear. Ever since Boswell's tremendous harvest Johnson has been a field for gleaners, and Mr. Reade is eminent among them. His meticulous attention to his own particular but not small section is making the field as clean as we can ever expect. Through his labours we are getting to know Dr. Johnson's earlier years as thoroughly as we know the later life, although, of course, in the absence of Boswell we can never know them as intimately.

Part VI of the *Gleanings* gave an account of Johnson's life from 1735 to 1740. Part VII is an appendix to this, and traces the genealogical history of families with whom Johnson and his wife were connected: Jervis of Peatling, Porter of Edgbaston, Eborall of Balsall, Hinckley of Lichfield, Darell of Fulmer, Norton and Eedes of Warwick, Colmore of Birmingham, Lucas of Guilsborough, and Thomson of Kent. There is also a large map to illustrate Dr. Johnson's origins and family associations as well as his life and movements down to 1740. Historians and genealogists will be grateful to Mr. Reade for the facts he has made available.

A. TILLOTSON.

Thomas Ellwood's "Davideis." A reprint of the first edition of 1712 with various readings of later editions. Edited with an introduction and notes by W. FISCHER. (*Englische Textbibliothek*, 21.) Heidelberg: Carl Winter. 1936. Pp. xviii+248. Rm. 8.

Professor Fischer has produced an efficient edition of Ellwood's pleasant poem *Davideis*. The editor gives the readings of the first six English editions. Textually the interest centres in the third edition of 1749, which contains a number of revisions. Professor Fischer has discovered an imperfect interleaved copy of the first edition which "shows an interesting attempt 'by another Hand' to bring about, and more radically in some places, all those changes ultimately effectuated in" the third edition. He gives evidence that the reviser was John Fry of Sutton Benger. The MS. revisions are given here in an appendix. The introduction deals with the composition and character of the poem, and its relation to Ellwood's *Sacred History* and to Cowley's *Davideis*. The notes are brief and concerned mainly with the close relations between Ellwood's poem and his *Sacred History*, particularly when, as often happens, reference to the prose works can clear up the text of the poem.

There are some twenty editions of *Davideis* recorded in England and America. Only two of these are later than the eighteenth century, and the poem has long been forgotten. We are grateful to Professor Fischer for providing us with an accurate reprint and an elucidation of an interesting incident in our literature.

A. TILLOTSON.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By MARGARET DOWLING

ELH, Vol. V., June 1938—

Sir Walter Raleigh as Poet and Philosopher (C. F. Tucker Brooke), pp. 93-112.

Two Spenserian Imitations, by "T. W." (F. Hard), pp. 113-26.

The Defense and Criticism of Pantomimic Entertainments in the Early Eighteenth Century (E. L. Avery), pp. 127-45.

Sir Gawain and the Order of the Garter (H. L. Savage), pp. 146-9.

The Narrative Material of *Apollonius of Tyre* (P. H. Goepf, 2nd), pp. 150-72.

LIBRARY, Vol. XIX., No. 1, June 1938—

The Austrian Post-Incunabula (Sir Stephen Gaselee), pp. 1-5.

Some English Mock-Prognostications (F. P. Wilson), pp. 6-43.

Short-Title Catalogue of English Corantos and Newsbooks, 1620-1642 (F. Dahl), pp. 44-98.

An Almanac for the Year 1478 (V. Scholderer), pp. 99-102.

The Correspondence between Sir Thomas Browne and John Evelyn (E. S. de Beer), pp. 103-6.

The Publication of the First Drapier Letter (Lord Rothschild), pp. 107-15.

MEDIUM ÆVUM, Vol. VII., No. 2, June 1938—

The Byrhtferth Glosses (C. W. Jones), pp. 81-97.

Chaucer's *Book of the Lion* (F. M. Dear), pp. 105-12.

Three Hitherto Unlisted MSS. of the French Prose *Brute Chronicle* (M. Dominica Legge and Georgine E. Brereton), pp. 113-7.

The Phrase *End of One's Kin* (C. T. Onions), pp. 118-9.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. LII., December 1937—

Pre-Restoration Poetry in Dryden's Miscellany (E. R. Wasserman), pp. 545-55.

A Middle English Prayer Roll (C. F. Bühler), pp. 555-62.

A Chaucer Allusion (Kathrine Koller), pp. 568-70.

Chaucer's *Taillynge Ynough* (C. Jones), p. 570.

The Monk's Tale, A Mediaeval Sermon (C. Jones), pp. 570-2.

The Date of Skelton's *Bowge of Court* (Helen S. Sale), pp. 572-4.

Spenser and Gosson (W. R. Orwen), pp. 574-6.

Historic Detail in *The Borderers* (H. F. Watson), pp. 577-9.
 Porphyria's Lover (C. R. Tracy), pp. 579-60.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. LIII., January 1938—

A Note for Baconians (Lily B. Campbell), pp. 21-3.

An Early Reference to Longinus (W. Ringler), pp. 23-4.

———— February —

Drayton's Lapidaries (D. C. Allen), pp. 93-5.

The Date of *Revenge for Honour* (C. L. Shaver), pp. 96-8.

Furetière and Wycherley: "Le Roman Bourgeois" in Restoration Comedy (E. E. Williams), pp. 98-104.

The Personal Names in *The Battle of Maldon* (H. B. Woolf), pp. 109-12.

"Bullock sterteþ, bucke verteþ" (E. E. Ericson), pp. 112-3.

Some Notes on Character-Writing (W. Sloane), pp. 113-6.

A *Lapsus Calami* of Jonathan Swift (Edith S. Krappe), pp. 116-7.

Spenser's Sthenoboea (D. C. Allen), pp. 118-9.

Two Notes on Dr. Faustus (M. P. Tilley), pp. 119-20.

Gothic Notes (A. M. Sturtevant), pp. 120-2.

———— March —

Hawthorne and "The Maypole of Merry-Mount" (G. H. Orians), pp. 159-67.

Jonson, Stow, and Drummond (H. Levin), pp. 167-9.

Milton and Miracles (M. Kelley), pp. 170-2.

Goldsmith and the Marquis d'Argens (A. Friedman), pp. 173-6.

"... moore feelynge than had Boece, . . ." (E. M. Dieckmann), pp. 177-80.

A Further Note on Old Age in Chaucer's Day (Brother C. Philip), pp. 181-2.

———— April —

The Earliest Carols and the Franciscans (R. H. Robbins), pp. 239-45.

Libri Impressi cum Notis Manuscriptis (C. F. Bühler), pp. 245-9.

Bede's Story of Cædmon again (Fr. Klaeber), pp. 249-50.

The Parson's Tale and the Marriage Group (Sister Mariella), pp. 251-6.

Chaucer and *The Decameron* (T. H. McNeal), pp. 257-8.

The Northern Homily Cycle, and Missionaries to the Saracens (J. E. Carver), pp. 258-61.

Spenser's Rhetoric and the "Doleful Lay" (H. D. Rix), pp. 261-5.

The Date of *A Midsommer Nights Dreame* (J. W. Draper), pp. 266-8.

"Full of his Roperipe" and "Roperipe Terms" (D. W. Thompson), pp. 268-72.

Cibber, *King John*, and the Students of the Law (E. L. Avery), pp. 272-5.

- The Source of Simon Eyre's catch-phrase (W. F. McNeir), pp. 275-6.
 Drayton's "Noah's Flood" (Kathleen Tillotson), p. 277.
 An Echo of Jonson in Aphra Behn's *Sir Patient Fancy* (C. B. Graham), pp. 278-9.
 An Earlier Text of Addison's Ode to Dr. Hannes (L. Bradner), pp. 279-80.
 The Date of Wordsworth's "The Birth of Love" (F. Christensen), pp. 280-2.
 Scott and Carducci (J. Rossi), pp. 287-90.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. LIII., May—

- "Mannyssh Wood"—Merchant's Tale (IV), 1530-1536 (F. L. Utle), 359-62.
 Shakespeare and Milton (T. Spencer), pp. 366-7.
 Dr. Johnson's 1745 Shakespeare Proposals (C. W. Hart), pp. 367-8.
 Pope on the Duke of Buckingham (A. Mizener), pp. 368-9.
 Crabbe and *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* (V. Lang), pp. 369-70.
 Whitman and Carlyle (J. J. Rubin), pp. 370-1.

— June—

- Milton and Thomas Young, 1620-1628 (W. R. Parker), pp. 399-407.
 Borrowings in Grange's "Golden Aphroditis" (M. P. Tilley), pp. 407-12.
 Thomas Beedome (C. L. Shaver), pp. 412-4.
 "The Hero; or, The Adventures of a Night" (A. D. McKillop), pp. 414-5.
 An Unknown Child of Landor's (R. H. Super), pp. 415-7.
 The Cartload in the Gate (A. J. Barnouw), pp. 417-21.
 Discussion of episodes in *Wallace, The Bruce* and *The Tragedy of Sir John van Olden-Barnavelt*.
 An Early Use of Donne's Fourth Satire (V. B. Heltzel), pp. 421-2.
 A Chaucerian Fisherman (?) (J. G. McManaway), pp. 422-3.
 Chaucerian Effects in *The Secrets of Angling*, by J. D.
 The Future Auxiliaries Gothic *Haben* and Old Norse *Munu* (A. M. Sturtevant), pp. 423-5.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXXIII., No. 3, July 1938—

- Lawful Espials (Helen L. Gardner), pp. 345-55.
 John Donne the Younger: Addenda and Corrections to his Biography (Margaret A. Beese), pp. 356-9.
 'Troilus,' II, 1298, again (T. A. Kirby), p. 402.
 A New Version of a Scottish Poem (Edith Bennett), p. 403.
 A Looking-Glass for London and England, 'Nutmegs and Ginger' (A. E. H. Swaen), pp. 404-5.
 The Publication of the 'Lyrical Ballads' (R. W. Daniel), pp. 406-10.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 174, June 4, 1938—

Thomas Clarkson as Champion of Brougham in 1818 (A. Lang Strout), pp. 398-401.

See also Mr. Strout's letter "Wordsworth *versus* Brougham," May 28, pp. 381-3.

Hannah Glasse and her *Art of Cookery* (A. Heal), pp. 401-3.

Discussion of the authorship of the book. Replies by M. H. Dodds, June 25, pp. 461-2, and July 23, pp. 68-9; by R. A. A.-L., July 16, p. 49; by V. H., August 6, p. 106.

A Jonson Allusion (C. E. Ward), p. 403.

"Johnsonian Gleanings" (A. L. Reade), pp. 403-4.

An appeal for help to solve certain problems. See p. 447.

— June 11—

Some Byron Relics (D. Caclamano), pp. 417-21.

Continued on July 23, p. 64.

De Quincey and Wordsworth (A. Lang Strout), pp. 423.

Wordsworth's contributions to *The Westmorland Gazette* during De Quincey's term of editorship.

— June 18—

Macaulay *versus* Montgomery (G. G. L.), pp. 434-6.

A discussion of Macaulay's attack on Robert Montgomery in the *Edinburgh Review*, April, 1830.

A Sorrow's Crown of Sorrow (Jane Green), pp. 436-8.

References to poets who have employed this sentiment.

— June 25—

Pen and Sword (J. L. Weir), pp. 452-5.

Some soldier-authors and their books.

— Vol. 175, No. 1, July 2—

Westminster and Jeremy Bentham (G. W. Wright), pp. 3-6.

Text of Bentham's unfinished essay on local institutions in Westminster.

British Travellers on George Washington's English (A. W. Read), p. 7.

References to printed comments by eighteenth-century travellers.

Stagira: Pronunciation (L. R. M. Strachan), pp. 11-12.

— July 9—

John Newton on Education (E. L. Giles), pp. 22-4.

Summary of his views.

Dipsas in Lyly and Marston (R. G. Howarth), pp. 24-5.

— July 16—

A Knight's Declaration (R. S. B.), p. 38.

Text of a sixteenth-century MS.

The Farming Books of Gervase Markham (1568?-1637) (G. E.

Fussell), pp. 39-41.

A discussion of his books on this subject.

Family Names from Old Documents (J. B. W. Chapman), pp. 41-3.

Selth (H. C. Cardew-Rendle), p. 43.

Evidence that it was a personal name.

The Ancestry of Daniel Defoe (P. D. Mundy), p. 44.

An attempt to identify Defoe's mother. *See also* a note by R. S. B., July 30, p. 86.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 174, July 23—

Homer: the translation of a word (L. and R.), pp. 56-7.

The translation of *pitthoi* by English authors. *See also* a letter by D. Caclamanos, August 6, p. 102.

July 30—

Pontac and Pontack's (E. S. de Beer), p. 74.

Identification of the M. Pontac of Evelyn's *Diary*.

Actæon: Myth and Moralising (Hibernicus), pp. 74-6.

Interpretations of the myth by literary men.

Incunabula in Dr. R. Nesbitt's Sale, 1761 (W. Roberts), p. 78.

List of entries given.

Swift and the Wagstaffe Papers (P. V. Thompson), p. 79.

Evidence against Swift's authorship.

August 6—

William Fulwood (Jean Robertson), pp. 97-9.

An investigation into the contention that William Fulwood, merchant tailor, was the author of *The enemie of idleness*.

Lips and Lettuce (Hibernicus), p. 99.

Literary use of the phrase.

August 13—

Angel Day (Jean Robertson), pp. 110-11.

Suggested identification of the author of *The Englishe Secretorie* with a legal disputant of that name in 1584.

Achilles and the Critics (Hibernicus), pp. 111-3.

The literary disparagement of Achilles.

The Aurora Borealis in Folk-Lore (B. Bonnerjea), pp. 113-4.

Hamlet: Three Notes (T. C. C.), p. 114.

Replies by H. K. Baker and Hibernicus, August 27, p. 158.

August 20—

Wordsworth: "The light that never was" (Senex), pp. 130-1.

The Forged 'Speeches and Prayers' of the Regicides: Another Edition (C. S. Paine), pp. 131-2.

A possible Source of a French quotation in the 'Religio Medici' (J. J. Menaugh), p. 132.

Notes on some False Byrons (S. P. Chew, Jr.), pp. 132-3.

Pope and Tennyson: a Possible Parallel (S. M. Steward), pp. 133-4.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 174, August 27—

Unpublished Letters from Sir George and Lady Beaumont to the Wordsworths (D. Sutton), pp. 146-9.

Quotations from letters ranging from 1803 to 1827.

The Ancient Family of Lumley (L. G. H. Horton-Smith), pp. 149-52.

A song of Herrick's altered by Burns (R. G. Howarth), p. 153.

Burns confesses, in a letter to George Thomson, to the alteration of "The Primrose."

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. XVII., April 1938—

Rousseau's Second Discourse in England from 1755 to 1762 (R. B. Sewall), pp. 97-114.

Edward Cave's Club, and its Project for a Literary Review (C. L. Carlson), pp. 115-20.

Sidney Lanier as a Literary Critic (G. W. Allen), pp. 121-38.

Moore's *The Foundling*—An Intermediary (R. L. Collins), pp. 139-43.

The "Tidy" (F. P. Wilson), pp. 216-8.

The Portraits in *Troilus and Criseyde* (L. A. Haselmayer, Jr.), pp. 220-3.

Keats and Spenser (C. B. Burke), pp. 223-4.

———— July—

Notes on the St. Omers College Theatre (W. H. McCabe), pp. 225-39.
Covering the period 1592 to 1762.

Flattery, A Shakespearean Tragic Theme (J. W. Draper), pp. 240-50.

The Geography of the *Interlude of the Four Elements* (G. P. Parks), pp. 251-62.

Some Chaucer Allusions, 1705-1799 (R. C. Boys), pp. 263-70.

Falstaff, An Elizabethan Glutton (J. W. Shirley), pp. 271-87.

Navagero's *De Cupidine & Hyella* (J. C. Fucilla), pp. 288-96.

Contains a discussion of the poem's English vogue 1742-1823.

The Debt of Fynes Moryson to Spenser's *View* (R. B. Gottfried), pp. 297-307.

How Jane Bell came to print the Third Quarto of Shakespeare's *King Lear* (L. Kirschbaum), pp. 308-11.

Wordsworth and the *Traité Élémentaire de Chimie* of Lavoisier (G. R. Potter), pp. 312-6.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Vol. LIII., No. 2, June 1938—

The Philosophy of Piers Plowman (H. W. Wells), pp. 339-49.

Spenser: the Uncertain Years 1584-1589 (R. Jenkins), pp. 350-62.

Milton's Family Bible (J. M. French), pp. 363-6.

Mary Palmer, alias Mrs. Andrew Marvell (F. S. Tupper), pp. 367-92.

Antiquarian Interest in Elizabethan Drama before Lamb (R. D. Williams), pp. 434-44.

Christabel sources in Percy's *Reliques* and the Gothic Romance (D. R. Tuttle), pp. 445-74.

Mrs. Gaskell in France, 1849-1890 (Annette B. Hopkins), pp. 545-74.

Irish Poets of Today and Blake (Grace Jameson), pp. 575-92.

The Sword Withdrawal in Robert de Boron's *Merlin* and in the *Queste del Saint Graal* (J. N. Carman), pp. 593-5.

The Date of Some Wakefield Borrowings from York (J. H. Smith), pp. 595-600.

The Dating of Skelton's Later Poems (H. L. R. Edwards), pp. 601-11.
 Answer by W. Nelson, pp. 611-4; replication by H. L. R. Edwards, pp. 614-9; rejoinder by W. Nelson, pp. 620-2.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXV., No. 3, July, 1938—

Shadwell's Use of Hobbes (T. B. Stroup), pp. 405-32.

Wordsworth: Forms and Images (B. Weaver), pp. 433-45.

Landor's Political Purpose (G. J. Becker), pp. 446-55.

The Influence of Addison on Charleston Periodicals, 1795-1860 (G. A. Cardwell, Jr.), pp. 456-70.

The Morgan Library Manuscript of Rossetti's "The Blessed Damozel" (J. A. Sanford), pp. 471-86.

Caliban upon Setebos (C. R. Tracy), pp. 487-99.

Some Recent Trends in English Literary Scholarship, with Special Reference to Mediaeval Backgrounds (G. R. Coffman), pp. 500-14.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, June 18—

Shakespeare and Will Hughes (A. J. A. Symons), p. 417.

Support for Oscar Wilde's theory that Mr. W. H. was a potential boy-actor.

"Richard III" (W. Van Lennep), p. 418.

Continuation of his letter of April 30, p. 296.

Defoe's "Review" (H. Bergholz), p. 424.

Data about extant copies. Reply by A. W. Secord, July 30, p. 508.

— June 25—

New Facts about Dr. Johnson (F. R. Lewis), p. 433.

Johnson's association with the Royal Society of Arts.

Mary Shelley and *Midas* (F. L. Jones), pp. 433-4.

Text of two letters concerning Mary Shelley's authorship of *Midas* and *Proserpine*. See also a letter by Miss S. Norman, July 2, p. 449.

— July 2—

A Letter from Dr. Johnson (D. Wecter), p. 449.

Text of his letter addressed to Mrs. Edmund Burke on the death of her father Dr. Christopher Nugent.

— July 9—

Ode on a Grecian Urn (J. R. Macgillivray), pp. 465-6.

A new imaginative stimulus for the poem's composition suggested. See also a letter by W. Roberts, August 20, p. 544.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, July 16—

A Critic of Wordsworth (A. Lang Strout), pp. 479-80.

Author of four articles on Wordsworth (*Blackwood's*, September-December, 1829) now proved to be C. H. Townshend, not John Wilson.

———— July 23—

Fanny Burney meets Edmund Burke (J. L. Clifford), p. 493.

Text of a letter from Fanny Burney to Mrs. Thrale describing the meeting.

———— July 30—

Chatterton & Kilburn Priory (E. H. W. Meyerstein), p. 507.

———— August 6—

An Unknown Keats Manuscript (C. D. Thorpe), p. 519.

A scrap of an autograph of "I Stood Tip-toe." Reply by M. B. Forman, August 13, p. 531. See also letter by M. B. Forman, August 27, pp. 555-6.

Parson Ford (A. L. Reade), pp. 519-20.

Biographical details.

———— August 13—

Mice and the Muse (G. S. Alleman), p. 531.

Quotation from Trinity College Dublin MS. of J. Grainger's "Sugar-Cane."

———— August 20—

An Englishman visits Voltaire (F. R. Lewis), pp. 543-4.

Description by Thomas Pennant of his meeting with Voltaire.

Carlyle and "The Germ" (H. Jervis), p. 544.

Text of a letter probably sent by Carlyle to the editors of *The Germ*.

———— August 27—

Kilvert's Clyro (T. P. Perks), p. 556.

A geographical correction.

Chaucer's Name (A. F. Pollard), p. 556.

A suggestion for its derivation.

UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1938

B.A. with Honours in English Language and Literature.

BELFAST.—English Literature :

Class II.—Div. 1 : Mary L. Jackson, W. E. N. Maxwell.

BIRMINGHAM.—English :

Class I.—Elsie D. Mulroy.

Class II.—Div. 1 : I. P. Alexander, Joan M. Mitchell. *Div. 2 :* Jessie M. Armstrong, Dorothea Dolphin, R. W. Griffiths, Rona I. Laurie, Marguerite M. Roeland, Marjorie G. Russell, Edith Scott, Mary M. A. Seency, A. R. P. Shield, T. F. Thompson, J. Townshend.

Class III.—Mary Jones.

BRISTOL.—English :

Class I.—C. S. Catling, G. W. Cockshott, Jessie F. McGahey.

Class II.—Div. 1 : Diana E. Bayley, Eileen M. Blackmore, Nina M. L. Collingborn, Joan H. Kay, Elizabeth A. Price, J. S. Pritchard. *Div. 2 :* G. R. A. Antrobus-Weston, F. Finney, G. R. Romans, Isabel L. Spiller, R. W. Walding.

Class III.—J. G. G. Brock.

CAMBRIDGE.—English Tripos, Part I :

Class I.—F. W. Bradbrook (Down.), W. B. Dean (King's), B. Dickinson (Down.), F. J. C. Friend-Pereira (Christ's), G. C. Greenfield (Down.), W. W. Harrison (Cath.), G. D. Klingopulos (Down.), F. Thistlethwaite (Joh.).

Class II.—Div. 1 : J. H. Bateman (Sid. Suss.), D. J. Coulson (Joh.), D. A. G. Douglas (Cla.), A. B. Drane (Joh.), W. Fitzpatrick (Jes.), C. M. Flood Page (Down.), P. G. B. Keuneman (Pemb.), A. C. Norfolk (Down.), J. D. Phillips (Christ's), C. C. D. Shute (King's), D. R. C. Steed (Cla.), W. E. Thorp (Emm.), J. W. Vernon (Emm.), P. M. Wilson (Cath.), R. O. C. Winkler (Down.), *Div. 2 :* C. A. Alldis (Emm.), D. A. Beacock (Emm.), G. R. Bishop (Christ's), A. E. Boucher (Trin.), L. E. C. Bruce (Queens'), C. A. G. Campbell (Trin.), B. M. Casper (Trin.), A. Champion (Selw.), B. A. L. Cranstone (Cath.), P. H. Crassweller (Cath.), J. B. G. da Silva (Trin.), G. A. Deaton (Down.), G. E. Denyer (Cath.), R. B. Ford (Down.), A. L. Fowler (Christ's), W. H. Ds Humphreys (Cath.), R. C. Ingham (Pet.), V. R. Ivanović (Pet.), R. M. Jeffery (Selw.), J. F. L. Long (Queens'), G. G. Moir (Pet.), R. B. Morley (Joh.), I. T. Nance (Trin. H.), A. G. Robinson (Jes.), J. C. Stamp (Queens'), P. R. V. Thomson (Cath.), H. S. Vaughan (Down.), P. Walton (Christ's), P. A. W. Warner (Cath.).

Class III.—W. E. D. Atkinson (Emm.), N. Barwick (Emm.), J. F. M. Braithwaite (King's), E. A. H. Chapple (Cath.), H. M. Clark (Pet.), L. M. Cooper (Jes.), E. D. Crew (Down.), L. H. Davies (Joh.), G. W. P. Fisher (Joh.), M. G. Holloway (Trin. H.), C. E. Holmes (Joh.), A. R. Jacobs (Trin.), N. E. Mitchell (Queens'), L. C. Moss (Jes.), J. Parsons (Cath.), A. S. Raeburn (Pemb.), L. H. Roper (Joh.), H. W. Roxburgh (Emm.), A. N. Rugg-Gunn (Joh.), A. F. Scott (Cai.), G. W. Taster (Down.), J. H. Webbe (Trin. H.), D. D. White (Christ's).

Ægrotat.—W. M. Otton (Cla.).

WOMEN.

Class I.—H. R. Huxley (Newn.).

Class II.—*Div. 1*: J. E. Blackaby (Girton), M. J. Challis (Girton), S. M. Falconer (Girton), E. J. Fisher (Newn.), M. R. T. Kirk (Newn.). *Div. 2*: J. Aubertin (Girton), J. L. Buss (Newn.), M. E. N. Clark (Girton), E. S. Graham (Newn.), P. Hackett (Girton), M. J. Harley-Mason (Girton), C. C. Jacoby (Girton), M. E. F. Knapp (Girton), A. C. Roberts (Girton).

Class III.—J. A. Adam (Newn.), E. Penman (Newn.), C. A. F. Watson (Newn.), M. E. Wilkinson (Newn.), J. D. Wilson (Girton).

PART II.

Class I.—*M. J. C. Hodgart (Pemb.), H. Thannhauser (Trin. H.), I. P. Watt (Joh.).

Class II.—*Div. 1*: J. S. Abraham (Down.), A. A. K. Arnold (Cath.), J. S. Bell (Down.), J. A. M. Berryman (Cla.), B. P. Bhatt (Pemb.), D. S. Bland (Emm.), H. C. G. Chase (Emm.), D. W. Doughty (Cath.), C. F. Eccleshare (Cath.), I. Kumar (Fitzw.), H. L. B. Sheridan (Trin.), R. W. Trubridge (Cai.), F. S. Whitehead (Fitzw.). *Div. 2*: D. C. Ballance (Magd.), N. Barrs (Christ's), K. R. Beeching (Down.), I. R. Bell (Cai.), J. Burns (Fitzw.), R. C. Churchill (Down.), I. A. Galloway (Pemb.), H. Harris (Christ's), J. S. Manifold (Jes.), F. Moorby (Down.), A. W. Price (Fitzw.), T. R. Thompson (Jes.), V. C. Trivedi (Cai.).

Class III.—J. N. Dhamija (Emm.), C. Jaffa (Queens'), R. R. Kenefeck (Down.), K. H. C. Lo (Fitzw.), M. R. S. Philips (Cai.), D. A. G. Reeve (Pemb.), C. J. Symington (Trin.), J. A. Whyte (Fitzw.).

WOMEN

Class I.—K. M. Kelly (Newn.).

Class II.—*Div. 1*: C. Hopkinson (Newn.), K. K. Laycock (Newn.), M. C. Townley (Newn.). *Div. 2*: A. A. J. Henderson (Girton), V. C. Kemp (Newn.), T. G. Mayor (Newn.), U. Y. Tann (Newn.).

DURHAM.—English:

Class I.—Mary F. E. Rainbow (St. Hild's.).

Class II.—*Div. 1*: D. Blackett (Hatf.), Marjorie Dixon (N. Cross), Sylvia M. Peters (King's). *Div. 2*: Robina G. Adams (King's), T. N.

* Distinction.

UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1938 509

Burdes (Univ.), E. I. Dobbie (Bede.), Eileen M. Evans (St. Mary's), Margaret J. W. Greenhow (King's), G. F. Lordon (King's), F. S. Lowe (King's), B. C. M. Stevenson (King's).

Class III.—Mary V. Hetherington (King's).

LEEDS.—English :

Class I.—J. Copley, T. R. Hodgson, M. H. Scargill, W. W. Thurlow, C. K. Young.

Class II.—F. Annal, Edwina L. Cowell, Elsie Griffiths, D. Hymas, A. Kelk, G. R. Pritchett.

Class III.—F. W. Lawson.

LIVERPOOL.—English :

Class I.—L. P. Ball, A. R. Croston.

Class II.—*Div. 1* : K. A. Argent, Edith M. Clark, Joyce M. Ellis, Mary K. Sesnan, T. Walsh. *Div. 2* : R. L. Bate, Eileen E. Bushell, G. Donaldson.

LONDON (Internal).—English :

Class I.—J. D. Davies (Q. M. C.), Gwenneth M. Garman (Q. M. C.), H. E. Hoffmann (U. C.), Marjorie J. Morgan (Q. M. C.), L. G. Whitbread (King's), E. W. Whittemore (King's).

Class II.—*Div. 1* : Norah K. Bremner (R. H. C.), A. H. Burfoot (U. C.), Betty J. Conway (Bedford), Aimée Couch (Westfield), Mary E. R. Coy (Westfield), Lucy M. Currie (King's), P. Cutler (Q. M. C.), Elizabeth G. Davies (U. C.), Mary M. Devlin (King's), J. W. E. Dunn (U. C.), Kathleen M. Ekins (Westfield), Joan Elliott (Bedford), J. C. Gleeson (King's), W. G. Hancock (U. C.), C. C. Hand (King's), Mary F. Hartley (U. C.), S. C. Heaven (King's), A. K. Hudson (U. C.), Margaret B. Hutt (Bedford), W. G. Mentern (Q. M. C.), Marjorie Morrell (R. H. C.), D. O'Shea (U. C.), F. N. L. Poynter (King's), Mary C. Rickwood (Bedford), Margaret Skerl (R. H. C.), Hope E. A. Symons (U. C.). *Div. 2* : A. Ahmad (U. C.), A. K. Banerjee (Q. M. C.), Norah Barter (Bedford), Betty F. Bird (U. C.), Edna M. Blackburn (King's), D. D. Brown (U. C.), J. D. H. Bullman (U. C.), Joan M. Carlton (U. C.), Denys P. J. Catling (King's), Joyce H. Davies (Bedford and Birkbeck), W. M. Duane (Q. M. C.), Beatrice P. Duncan (King's), Mary E. Edmondson (U. C.), Gwenneth N. Fletcher (R. H. C.), Margaret Green (U. C.), Fanny Greenspan (U. C.), Vanessa Harrison (R. H. C.), H. L. Hodson (U. C.), Enid M. Hope (Bedford), Barbara D. Horne (King's), Jean M. Ingram (Bedford), E. B. Jenkins (Birkbeck), Catherine T. Johnstone (King's), Ella M. Kibble (King's), Mary F. King (Westfield), Evelyn M. Magness (Westfield), J. Milburn (U. C.), I. M. P. Millar (U. C.), Joan E. Neilson (Westfield), Molly E. Payne (Bedford), Eleanor M. Pearson (Bedford), L. J. Pickford (Birkbeck), Marguerite Radford (R. H. C.), Margaret R. Roberts (R. H. C.), R. W. Smith (U. C.), Margaret H. Spencer (Westfield), W. G. Thompson (King's), Edna M. Webb (King's), Daphne M. Williams (King's), W. G. Wilson (King's), Evelyn M. Withers (Bedford), Gertrude J. Woodfield (Bedford).

Class III.—Joan M. Beechey (Bedford), Hilary M. M. Dean (U. C.), Kathleen A. F. Dodds (R. H. C.), Elizabeth M. Hanby (R. H. C.), F. G. Holland (King's), D. A. Jilla (U. C.), D. A. North (Birkbeck), D. N. Nuttall (King's), G. K. L. Ogilby (U. C.), Margaret L. Olesen (Westfield), Audrey C. Opie (Bedford), Eileen M. Tabor (Westfield), Margaret A. Wilson-Smith (R. H. C.).

LONDON (External).—English :

Class I.—J. W. Court (U. C. Hull), Millicent M. B. Geoffrey Smith (Priv.), Gwyneth E. Rowlands (King's).

Class II.—*Div. 1* : Eileen M. Gallagher (Priv.), Daphne E. B. Girdlestone (U. C. South.), S. E. Jackson (Priv.), I. L. Michael (Priv.), Joan E. M. Scruse (U. C. South.), F. Setterington (U. C. Ex.). *Div. 2* : A. F. Allison (U. C. South.), P. D. Archard (U. C. South.), Muriel Bristow (U. S. South.), Doris K. Clarke (U. C. South.), T. G. S. Cook (U. C. Nott.), H. D. Holmes (U. C. Nott.), R. S. Learmouth (U. C. South.), Marjorie Ludlow (U. C. South.), Jean M. Martin (U. C. Ex.), L. H. Moore (U. C. South.), Betty Smart (U. C. Ex.), Margaret J. Tagg (U. C. Nott.), Joan M. Ware (U. C. Ex.), F. G. Whelan (U. C. Hull).

Class III.—V. M. O. Bell (U. C. South.), Vera B. M. Catlin (U. C. Nott.), Violet C. Davies (U. C. Ex.), P. C. Elvins (Priv.), Ruby M. Fitzer (Priv.), Audrey Harvey (U. C. Ex.), Jessie M. I. Landon (Priv.), Doris Marshall (U. C. South.), C. R. Messiter-Tooze (Priv.), G. Paget (Priv.), Phyllis J. Pellow (U. C. Ex.), J. L. Reed (U. C. Ex.).

MANCHESTER.—English Language and Literature :

Class I.—Marie Ashworth, Catherine D. Bolton, T. D. W. George, Stella Maguire.

Class II.—*Div. 1* : H. Bilbrough, Alma B. Grindley, Ruth M. Manley, J. Mullineaux, Esmé A. Stokes, Mary A. Thatcher, Gladys C. Turner. *Div. 2* : Jean K. Buckingham, A. S. Lowe, J. H. Oldfield, Mary W. Pyke, Jean L. Rae, S. Wade, Jessie Woods-Wilson.

OXFORD.—English Language and Literature.

Class I.—E. R. Bentley (Univ.), V. K. Gokak (Jesus), W. A. W. Jarvis (St. Edm. Hall), Penelope M. Knox (Som.), Hope V. Rossitter (Som.).

Class II.—H. Blamires (Univ.), N. Bradshaw (Magd.), C. H. Brown Vance (St. Edm. Hall), J. R. Bunting (Queen's), B. W. Cave-Brown-Cave (St. Edm. Hall), K. J. Garlick (Ball.), R. W. Hall (Exeter), E. W. Harrison (St. Edm. Hall), M. K. Joseph (Mert.), S. A. Mason (Oriel), A. R. Miller (Linc.), M. J. Moynihan (Magd.), B. G. Murray (St. Peter's Hall), J. C. Perceval-Clark (Trin.), J. G. Rideout (St. Edm. Hall), R. J. Ridout (St. Cath.), R. N. D. Room (Corpus Chr.), K. G. Schroeder (Campion Hall), R. L. Sharp (St. Edm. Hall), J. B. Squire (St. Edm. Hall), P. J. Stead (Pemb.), T. Taylor (Univ.), A. H. Warren (Mert.), R. D. Watkinson (St. Cath.).

Jane K. Aiken (Som.), Bethia N. Bell (L. M. H.), Catherine H. W. Bickle (Som.), Pauline M. Birley (St. Hug.), Mary R. Carr (L. M. H.),

Sheila C. M. Copley (H.-S.), Joan M. Devlin (H.-S.), Margery G. Duce (St. Hug.), Gladys E. Fernie (St. Hild.), Katharine M. Fisk (L. M. H.), Phyllis E. Gadsden (St. Hild.), Margaret Garnett (St. Hug.), Joan C. Gatehouse (H.-S.), Joyce A. Gauntlett (L. M. H.), Margaret Gay (St. Hug.), Mary E. Grant (L. M. H.), Barbara Henderson (St. Hild.), Helen M. Hepworth (L. M. H.), Mary H. Higginbotham (L. M. H.), Dora J. Humby (L. M. H.), Mavis E. Kilpatrick (L. M. H.), Evelyn H. G. La'Brooy (St. Hug.), Margaret A. Macmillan (H.-S.), Lorna M. M. Mitchell (H.-S.), Marjorie M. Phillips (St. Hild.), Sheila I. Ramsay (St. Hild.), Margaret Sheehan (St. Hug.), Sheila Sheppard B. (St. Hild.), Kathleen E. Steel (H.-S.), Marion A. Strevens (H.-S.), Joan M. Summers (St. Hug.), Irene M. Townsend (St. Hug.), Maryllis D. Tull (St. Hug.), Enid W. Walker (St. Hild.), Jean E. West (L. M. H.), Sheila H. M. Wilson (St. Hug.), Elizabeth D. Wimberley (L. M. H.).

Class III.—W. F. Andrewes (Keb.), R. M. Baine (Mert.), J. Battarbee (St. John's), C. G. Bell (Exeter), R. N. Brayshaw (Queen's), J. H. Brock (Oriol), A. G. N. Brodribb (Univ.), R. J. Charleston (New), A. R. Clark (St. Edm. Hall), W. J. Clarke (Wadh.), C. P. Craine (Brasnose), E. P. Heriz-Smith (Brasnose), K. W. Humphreys (St. Cath.), T. L. I. S. V. Iremonger (Oriol), A. C. E. Karn (Univ.), I. N. Miller (St. Peter's Hall), L. H. Palmer (Exeter), A. S. R. Parker (St. Peter's Hall), N. B. Randall (St. John's), J. A. Roemmele (Wadh.), J. W. Stewart (St. John's), R. M. Sullivan (St. Cath.), Yiu Tung (Oriol).

Margaret E. Adams (H.-S.), Mary R. Bruce (L. M. H.), Fannie M. Cohen (Som.), Muriel R. Edmunds (St. Hild.), Ruth Elliott (St. Hild.), Doreen F. Francis (H.-S.), Christine B. Gibb (H.-S.), Emily R. Hirsch (H.-S.), Maisie G. Hunter (St. Hild.), Katharine P.-K. Lai (H.-S.), Colette L. Le Rossignol (H.-S.), Isalen M. F. Maunsell (St. Hild.), Margaret Rhodes (Som.), Mary H. Smith (H.-S.), Eda D. Stringer (St. Hild.), Miranda C. Tallents (L. M. H.), Hilda I. Thackray (St. Hild.), Elizabeth Le P. Trench (Som.), Alice D. Watt (H.-S.), Joyce M. Whitehead (St. Hug.).

Class IV.—W. W. Burton (Chr. Ch.), R. W. Horner (St. Peter's Hall), S. J. M. E. Hutton (Ball.), L. Perry (New), J. Snowdon (St. Peter's Hall).
Ægrotat.—Marjory M. B. Magner (H.-S.).

READING.—English :

Class I.—F. W. Essex, Joan M. S. Lovegrove.

Class II.—*Div. 1* : Edith M. Coope, Marjorie Pike. *Div. 2* : Gertrude E. Champion, Marjorie Solberg.

Class III.—Albert G. Warren.

SHEFFIELD.—English Language and Literature :

Class I.—W. A. Armstrong.

Class II.—*Div. 1* : G. W. Simpson. *Div. 2*, Constance R. Stirk, Betty L. Wilson.

WALES.—English :

Class I.—S. E. Blunt (Card.), J. C. Brookes (Card.), Mary Coldwell

(Swan.), A. B. Cottle (Card.), R. Griffiths (Ban.), N. James (Aber.), W. K. Lewis (Aber.), A. Thomas (Card.), B. Rees (Aber.).

Class II.—Div. 1: Margaret R. K. Binstead (Card.), W. J. F. Davies (Aber.), D. J. Evans (Aber.), Gwladys M. Jewell (Aber.), Jessany R. Jones (Card.), Esther M. Lewis (Aber.), Muriel J. McKelvie (Card.), D. C. Merchant (Card.), W. H. Morris (Aber.), W. H. Parry (Card.), R. K. Pulling (Card.), J. H. Turner (Card.), Anna M. Vevar (Ban.), Marjorie M. Watkins (Swan.), Catherine E. Williams (Aber.), K. E. Williams (Ban.), *Div. 2:* Margery E. Benham (Card.), H. S. Davis (Card.), Nancie A. Evans (Swan.), Ithel W. Jones (Ban.), Joyce Jones (Card.), Margaret L. Jones (Aber.), L. D. Kettle (Swan.), Dilys Morris (Card.), Violet I. Neads (Card.), Charlotte O. Nicholas (Aber.), G. Parry (Ban.), Dilys M. Rowe (Swan.), Mair E. Williams (Aber.), Margaret A. Williams (Card.).

*Class III.—*Vera Evans (Card.), Gwyneth A. Jones (Aber.), M. J. Jones (Card.).

SCOTLAND (M.A.)

ABERDEEN.—English Language and Literature :

Class I.—Isabella McK. F. Henderson, K. A. G. Murray, W. B. de B. Nicoll, Anne E. Scott.

Class II.—J. A. Bain, Isobel J. Douglas, Margaret R. Ferguson, Mary M. M. Macpherson, T. J. A. Mair, A. N. Smith.

Class III.—R. W. S. Noble, Susanna A. C. Pratt.

EDINBURGH.—English :

Class I.—Margaret Mack Fyfe, K. A. E. D. Paxton.

Class II.—Elizabeth R. G. Campbell, Eleanor G. L. Carnon, D. Doull, W. J. Pottinger, A. A. S. Stark, Mary W. Stephen, Rosemary Turnell, Esther M. Walton, R. Winchester.

Class III.—Mary J. H. Reid.

INDEX

- Abbott, C. C., his *Catalogue of Papers relating to Boswell, Johnson & Sir William Forbes* reviewed, 230
- A.B.C. of *English Usage*, An, by H. A. Treble and G. H. Vallins, reviewed, 375
- Adams, J. C., article on *The Staging of "The Tempest,"* III, iii, 404
- Adams, J. Q., his introduction to a facsimile ed. of the first quarto, 1594, of *Titus Andronicus*, reviewed, 86
- Alexander, P., reviews by, 67, 339
- Allen, D. C., his ed. of *Francis Meres's Treatise "Poetrie,"* reviewed, 88
- America in *English Fiction, 1760-1800: the Influence of the American Revolution*, by R. B. Heilman, reviewed, 228
- American English, A Dictionary of, on Historical Principles*, ed. Sir Wm. Craigie and J. R. Hulbert, reviewed, 493
- American Speech*, vols. VIII-XI, XII (Parts 1 and 2), reviewed, 241
- Andronicus*, 1661, *The Unfortunate Usurper*, 1663, and John Wilson's *Andronicus Comnenius*, relations between, 145
- Annot and *Johon*, note by K. Malone, 327
- Antichrist*, ed. W. W. Greg, letter in reference to F. M. Salter's review of, 79
- Arcadia*, *Sir Philip Sidney and the*, by M. S. Goldman, reviewed, 206
- Archæology, Scandinavian*, by H. Sheltig and H. Falk, translated by E. V. Gordon, reviewed, 333
- Arte of English Poesie, The*, by G. Puttenham, ed. Gladys D. Willcock and Alice Walker, reviewed, 81
- Autobiography, by E. Gibbon, ed. Sheffield, article on by Marjorie C. Hill, 440
- Bacon, Elizabeth, her marriage to George Gascoigne, 257
- Baker, E. A., review by, 228; notice by, 245
- Baker, J. M., his *Henry Crabb Robinson of Bury, Jena, "The Times," and Russell Square*, reviewed, 232
- Bald, R. C., review by, 91; notices by, 496, 497
- Ballads, a note by Kathleen Tillotson on the source of *An Excellent New Ballad, shewing the Petigree of . . . King James*, 173
- Barnard, E., his *Shelley's Religion*, reviewed, 480
- Barrow, Isaac, plagiarized by Sidney Smith, 203
- Bateson, F. W., review by, 233; notice by, 244
- Beaumont and Fletcher, their *Philaster*, 1620, a "bad quarto," 42
- Bedford, the fifth Earl (first Duke) of, household accounts of, 99
- Beer, E. S. de, note on the site of Diodati's house, 78
- "*Beowulf*," *The Style and Structure of*, article by Joan Blomfield, 396
- Blackmore, Sir Richard, *The Dispensary*, and the Captain of the Wits, note by B. Boyce, 453
- Blake, W., *William Blake's Circle of Destiny*, by M. O. Percival, reviewed, 476
- Blickling Homily XIII, The Two Accounts of the Assumption in*, article by R. Willard, 1
- Blomfield, Joan, article on *The Style and Structure of "Beowulf,"* 396; review by, 333
- Boas, F. S., his *From Richardson to Pinero: Some Innovators and Idealists*, reviewed, 107
- Bodurtha, Dorothy H., her ed. of C. A. Brown's *Life of John Keats*, reviewed, 490

- Bond, R. W., his ed. of the *Marlay Letters*: 1778-1820, reviewed, 478
- Bonner, W. H., his *De Quincey at Work*, reviewed, 111
- Borgman, A. S., his *Life and Death of William Mountfort*, noticed, 244
- Boswell, J., papers relating to, see Abbott
- Boyce, B., a note on The Dispensary, Sir Richard Blackmore and the Captain of the Wits, 453
- Bowers, F. T., letter concerning H. Glapthorne's *Revengé for Honour*, 329
- Braddy, H., note on Froissart's Account of Chaucer's Embassy in 1377, 63
- Bradner, L., note on the authorship of *Spencer Redivivus*, 323
- Brawne, Fanny, *Letters of, to Fanny Keats (1820-1824)*, ed. F. Edgcombe, reviewed, 490
- Breton, N., E. G. Morice's ed. of *Grimellos Fortunes* (1604) and *An Olde Mans Lesson* (1605), reviewed, 469
- Breton, William, his marriage to Elizabeth Bacon, 257
- Brown, C. A., *Some Letters and Miscellanea of Charles Brown, The friend of John Keats and Thomas Richards*, ed. M. B. Forman, reviewed, 490; his *Life of John Keats*, ed. Dorothy H. Bodurtha and W. B. Pope, reviewed, 490
- Brown, Tom, and the proposed dispensary in 1687, 453
- Buckingham, *The Complaint of Henry Duke of*, ed. Marguerite Hearsey, reviewed, 209
- Budd, F. E., article on *A Translation Attributed to Evelyn*: "The Manner of Ordering Fruit-trees" (1660), 285
- Bühler, C. F., article on *Some New Paston Documents*, 129
- Bunyan, J., *Der typisch puritanische Ideengehalt in Bunyan's "Life and Death of Mr. Badman"*, reviewed, 355
- Burke, E., article by D. Wecter on *Four Letters from George Crabbe to Edmund Burke*, 298
- "But this and then no more" (Harl. MS. 7392), a note by Helen Sandison on the suggested ascriptions to Dyer and to Gorges, 449
- Butt, J., review by, 471
- Byrom, H. J., reviews by, 81, 209
- Carlyle and German Thought*: 1819-1834, by C. F. Harrold, noticed, 245
- Carver, P. L., reviews by, 365, 480
- Casson, T. E., reviews by, 487, 490
- Catalogue, A, of Papers relating to Boswell, Johnson & Sir William Forbes*, by C. C. Abbott, reviewed, 230
- Cavalier Drama: An Historical and Critical Supplement to the Study of the Elizabethan and Restoration Stage*, by A. Harbage, reviewed, 352
- Chapman, R. W., review by, 359
- Charleville, Countess of, see *Marley Letters*
- Chaucer, G., "Free Bull," note by G. Homans, 447; Froissart's Account of Chaucer's Embassy in 1377, note by H. Braddy, 63; the portraits in Chaucer's *fabliaux*, 310
- Clark, W. S., letter concerning Dryden's biography, 330
- Clemen, W., his *Shakespeares Bilder: ihre Entwicklung und ihre Funktionen im dramatischen Werk* reviewed, 213
- Clyde, W. M., reviews by, 102, 357
- Coleridge, Hartley, *The Letters of*, ed. Grace Griggs and E. L. Griggs, reviewed, 371
- Costume in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*, by M. Channing Linthicum, reviewed, 91
- Crabbe, G., article by D. Wecter on *Four Letters from George Crabbe to Edmund Burke*, 298
- Craigie, Sir Wm., his *Dictionary of American English on Historical Principles*, Part I, reviewed, 493; his *Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue*, Part VII, noticed, 496
- Crane, W. G., his *Wit and Rhetoric in the Renaissance* reviewed, 466
- Crofts, J., his *Shakespeare and the Post-Horses: a New Study of "The Merry Wives of Windsor"* reviewed, 93

- Curry, K., note on the uncollected translations of Michaelangelo by Wordsworth and Southey, 193
- Curry, W. C., his *Shakespeare's Philosophical Patterns* noticed, 496
- Daiches, D., his *New Literary Values. Studies in Modern Literature* noticed, 244
- Daily Meditations*, by P. Pain (a facsimile ed. with an introduction by L. Howard), reviewed, 357
- Daniel, Thomas, freebooter (?), 1450, 130
- Davideis*, by T. Ellwood, ed. W. Fischer, noticed, 498
- Davis, B. E. C., reviews by, 107, 118, 240, 476, 495; notice by, 246
- Deaf mutes, teaching of in 17th century, 424
- Death and Elizabethan Tragedy*, by T. Spencer, reviewed, 346
- Decline and Fall of the Romantic Ideal, The*, by F. L. Lucas, reviewed, 233
- Defoe, Daniel, a note on the character of (the civet-cat venture), by J. R. Moore, 68
- Dekker, T., his and others' *Sir Thomas Wyatt*, a "bad quarto," 33
- De Quincey at Work*, by W. H. Bonner, reviewed, 111
- Dictionary, A., of *American English on Historical Principles*, ed. Sir Wm. Craigie and J. R. Hulbert, reviewed, 493
- Dictionary, A., of *the Older Scottish Tongue*, Part VII, by Sir W. A. Craigie, noticed, 496
- Diodati, J., note by E. S. de Beer on Diodati's house, 78
- Directions for Speech and Style*, by J. Hoskins, ed. H. H. Hudson, reviewed, 97
- Dispensary, the, Sir Richard Blackmore and the Captain of the Wits, note by B. Boyce, 453; Garth's *Dispensary*, 455
- Dowling, Margaret, *Summary of Periodical Literature*, 121, 249, 377, 499; notice by, 243
- Drama: *Cavalier Drama*, by A. Harbage, reviewed, 352; *Death and Elizabethan Tragedy*, by T. Spencer, reviewed, 346; *Early Victorian Drama*, by E. Reynolds, reviewed, 372; *The Jacobean Drama*, by U. M. Ellis-Fermor, reviewed, 94; *Plays about the Theatre in England from "The Rehearsal" in 1671 to the Licensing Act in 1737*, by D. F. Smith, noticed, 497
- Drayton, Michael, plagiarism from a ballad, 173
- Dryden, J., letter concerning his biography, by W. S. Clark, 330; *Hymns Attributed to John Dryden*, ed. by G. R. Noyes and G. R. Potter, reviewed, 348
- Dyer, Sir E., note by Helen Sandison on the suggested ascription of "But this and then no more" to him, 449
- Edgumbe, F., his ed. of *Letters of Fanny Brawne to Fanny Keats (1820-1824)* reviewed, 490
- Edward IV, summons to military service directed to Sir John Paston, 1469. 135
- Effictio*, a device of mediæval rhetoric, 311
- Eighteenth Century, John Locke and English Literature of the*, by K. Maclean, reviewed, 357
- Eland, G., reviews by, 99, 478
- Elizabethan Stage, see Drama
- Ellis-Fermor, U. M., her *Jacobean Drama* reviewed, 94
- Ellwood, T., his poem *Davideis*, ed. W. Fischer, noticed, 498
- Enfield, W., plagiarized by Sydney Smith, 200
- English, A History of Modern Colloquial*, 3rd ed., by H. G. Wyld, noticed, 120
- English Association, The, their *Essays and Studies*, vols. XXI, XXII, reviewed, 240, 118
- English Literature, History of, see W. F. Schirmer, *Geschichte*
- English Usage, An A.B.C. of*, by H. A. Treble and G. H. Vallins, reviewed, 373
- Essays and Studies*, vol. XXI, collected by H. Read, reviewed, 240; vol. XXII, collected by Helen Darbishire, reviewed, 118

- Essays by Divers Hands* (Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature), vol. xvi, ed. G. P. Gooch, reviewed, 495
- Evans, B. Ifor, review by, 372
- Evelyn, J., article by F. E. Budd on *A Translation Attributed to Evelyn: "The Manner of Ordering Fruit-Trees"* (1660), 285
- Ewen, F., his *Prestige of Schiller in England: 1788-1859*, noticed, 246
- Examination Results, 1938, 507
- Faire Em*, a "bad quarto," 38
- Falk, H., his *Scandinavian Archaeology*, translated by E. V. Gordon, reviewed, 333
- Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth, The*, a "bad quarto," 33
- Fastolf, Sir John, indenture between him and Hugh Acton, 1451, 134
- Faust Tradition, Sources of the*, from *Simon Magus to Lessing*, by P. M. Palmer and R. P. More, reviewed, 239
- Fiction, *America in English Fiction, 1760-1800*, by R. B. Heilman, reviewed, 228
- Finney, C. L., his *Evolution of Keats's Poetry* reviewed, 115
- "*Firumbras*" and "*Otuel and Roland*," ed. Mary I. O'Sullivan, reviewed, 461
- Fischer, W., his ed. of Thomas Ellwood's *Davideis*, noticed, 498
- Forbes, Sir William, papers relating to, see Abbott
- Forman, M. B., his ed. of *Some Letters and Miscellanea of Charles Brown, The Friend of John Keats and Thomas Richards*, reviewed, 490
- "Free Bull," note by G. Homans, 447
- Froissart's Account of Chaucer's Embassy in 1377, a note by H. Braddy, 63
- From Richardson to Pinero: Some Innovators and Idealists*, by F. S. Boas, reviewed, 107
- Fruit-Trees, The Manner of Ordering*, now attributed to J. Evelyn, 285
- Fuller, T., his *Life of Andronicus*, 145
- Garth, Sir Samuel, and his *Dispensary*, 455
- Gascoigne, George, and Elizabeth Bacon Breton Boyes Gascoigne, article by C. T. Prouty, 257
- Geffen, Elizabeth M., note on the parentage of Edmund ("Rag") Smith, 72
- George a Greene, a "bad quarto," 40
- George of Prussia, The, a ship, 130
- Gibbon, E., article by Marjorie C. Hill on the Sheffield ed. of his *Autobiography*, 440
- Gismond of Salerne, see Tancred and Gismund
- Glaphorne, H., letter concerning his *Revenge for Honour*, by F. T. Bowers, 329
- Gloucester, Richard, Duke of, and Edmund Paston, indenture between, 1475, 136
- Gold, M. B., his *Swift's Marriage to Stella together with Unprinted and Misprinted Letters* reviewed, 108
- Goldman, M. S. his *Sir Philip Sidney and the Arcadia* reviewed, 206
- Goldsmith's *Critical Outlook*, article by W. Vaughan Reynolds, 155
- Gooch, G. P., his collected *Essays by Divers Hands*, vol. xvi, reviewed, 495
- Gorges, A., note by Helen Sandison on the suggested ascription of "But this and then no more" to him, 449
- Gordon, E. V., his translation of *Scandinavian Archaeology*, by H. Sheltig and H. Falk, reviewed, 333
- Gotischen Syntax, Zur: Qiman in und Vervandtes*, von Dr. L. Zato il, noticed, 246
- Gover, J. E. B., his *Place-names of Warwickshire* reviewed, 375
- Government and the Press, 1695-1763*, by L. Hanson, 102
- Grabo, C., his *Magic Plant: The Growth of Shelley's Thought* reviewed, 365
- Green, George and Sarah, by Dorothy Wordsworth, ed. de Selincourt, reviewed, 111
- Greene, R., his *Orlando Furioso* a "bad quarto," 29
- Greg, W. W., letter in reference to F. M. Salter's review of his ed. of *Antichrist*, 79; reviews, 93, 216, 344

- Grierson, Sir Herbert, letter by, in reply to review of his *Milton and Wordsworth*, 458; his *Milton and Wordsworth* reviewed, 225; *Seventeenth Century Studies presented to him*, reviewed, 471
- Griggs, E. L., his ed. of *The Letters of Hartley Coleridge* reviewed, 371
- Griggs, Grace, her ed. of *The Letters of Hartley Coleridge* reviewed, 371
- Grimmellos *Fortunes* (1604), by N. Breton, ed. F. G. Morice, reviewed, 469
- Grylls, R. G., his *Mary Shelley* reviewed, 487
- Hamlet*, 1603, a "bad quarto," 24
- Hamlet's Apotheosis of Man—its punctuation, note by R. J. Kane, 67
- Hanson, L., his *Government and the Press, 1695-1763*, reviewed, 102
- Harbage, A., his *Cavalier Drama* reviewed, 352
- Harleian MS. 7392, see "But this and then no more"
- Harrold, C. F., his *Carlyle and German Thought: 1819-1834*, noticed, 245
- Hartman, H., note on Wordsworth's "Lapland Night," 189
- Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, contents of vols. xvi, xviii, and xix, 247
- Harvey, Sir Paul, his *Oxford Companion to English Literature*, 2nd ed., noticed, 243
- Haselmayer, L. A., note on the portraits in Chaucer's *Fabliaux*, 310
- Häusermann, H. W., review by, 492
- Havens, R. D., a note on the structure of Smart's *Song to David*, 178
- Hazen, A. T., his *Samuel Johnson's Prefaces and Dedications* reviewed, 359
- Hearsey, Marguerite, her ed. of *The Complaint of Henry Duke of Buckingham* reviewed, 209
- Heilman, R. B., his *America in English Fiction, 1760-1800: the Influence of the American Revolution*, reviewed, 228
- Helmont, Francis Mercury Van, article on his contribution to the science of Language, 420
- Henry V*, 1600, a "bad quarto," 23
- Henry VI, letter to R. Waller and others, 130
- Herford, C. H., his ed. of *Ben Jonson*, vol. v, reviewed, 216; vol. vi reviewed, 344
- Heywood, T., his *If You Know Not Me, Pt. I*, a "bad quarto," 31
- Hill, Marjorie C., article on *The Sheffield Edition of Gibbon's "Autobiography"*, 440
- Hilles, F. W., his *Literary Career of Sir Joshua Reynolds* reviewed, 231
- Homans, G., note on "Free Bull," 447
- Hoppe, H. R., article on *The First Quarto Version of Romeo and Juliet*, III, vi, and IV. v. 43 ff., 271
- Hoskins, J., his *Directions for Speech and Style*, ed. H. H. Hudson, reviewed, 97
- Houghton, F. T. S., see Warwickshire
- Howard, L., see Pain, P.
- Hudson, H. H., his ed. of J. Hoskins's *Directions for Speech and Style* reviewed, 97
- Hulbert, J. R., his *Dictionary of American English on Historical Principles*, Part I, reviewed, 493
- Huntington Library Bulletin*, *The* (No. 4), noticed, 247
- Iceland, Romance in*, by Margaret Schlauch, reviewed, 238
- Jacobean Drama, The*, by U. M. Ellis-Fermor, reviewed, 94
- Jackson, A., article on *The Stage and the Authorities, 1700-1714 (As Revealed in the Newspapers)*, 53
- Johnson, S., *Johnsonian Gleanings*, Part vii, by A. L. Reade, noticed, 498; *Samuel Johnson's Prefaces and Dedications*, by A. T. Hazen, reviewed, 359; papers relating to, see Abbott
- Jonson, B., a note by Evelyn Simpson on Ben Jonson's *A New-Yeares-Gift*, 175; *Ben Jonson*, vol. v, ed. C. H. Herford and P. Simpson, reviewed, 205; vol. vi, ed. C. H. Herford and P. and Evelyn Simpson, reviewed, 344; *Songs and Lyrics by Ben Jonson* reviewed, 341
- Journal from Parnassus, A*, ed. H. Macdonald, reviewed, 223

- Jugie, Père Martin, his work on the Greek literature of the Virgin Mary, 2
- Kane, R. J., note on Hamlet's Apotheosis of Man—its Punctuation, 67
- Keats, Fanny, *Letters of Fanny Brawne to (1820-1824)*, ed. F. Edgcombe, reviewed, 490
- Keats, J., *The Evolution of Keats's Poetry*, by C. L. Finney, reviewed, 115; *Life of John Keats*, by C. Armitage Brown, ed. Dorothy H. Bodurtha and W. B. Pope, reviewed, 490; *Some Letters and Miscellanea of Charles Brown, The Friend of John Keats and Thomas Richards*, ed. M. B. Forman, reviewed, 490
- King Lear*, 1608, a "bad quarto," 26
- King, R. W., reviews by, 115, 232
- Kirschbaum, L., article on *A Census of Bad Quartos*, 20
- Knack to Know an Honest Man, A, a "bad quarto," 32
- Knevett, Ralph, Author of the "Supplement" to Spenser's "*Faerie Queene*," article by C. Bowie Millican, 44
- Kreuzer, J. R., note on some earlier examples of the rhetorical device in *Ralph Roister Doister* (III. iv. 33 ff.), 321
- Language, Francis Mercury Van Helmont: *A neglected seventeenth-century contribution to the science of language*, article by Grace B. Sherrer, 420
- Leeds Studies in English and Kindred Languages*, No. 3, noticed, 243
- le Gendre, the Sieur, his book on fruit-trees, 285
- Leishman, J. B., reviews by, 213, 221, 341, 475
- Lennox, Charlotte Ramsey, *An Eighteenth-century Lady of Letters*, by Miriam R. Small, noticed, 497
- Life and Death of Mr. Badman, The*, by J. Bunyan, see Bunyan
- Life in a Noble Household, 1641-1700*, by Gladys S. Thomson, reviewed, 99
- Lip-reading, F. M. Van Helmont and, 423
- Linthicum, M. Channing, her *Costume in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*, reviewed, 91
- Literary Sessions*, by E. Partridge, noticed, 246
- Literary Values, New*, by D. Daiches, noticed, 244
- Locke, John, and *English Literature of the Eighteenth Century*, by K. Maclean, reviewed, 357
- Lounsbury, T. R., on John Wilson and Tennyson, 429
- Lucas, F. L., his *Decline and Fall of the Romantic Ideal*, reviewed, 233
- Macdonald, H., his ed. of *A Journal from Parnassus* reviewed, 223; review by, 348
- MacGregor, D. C., review by, 355
- McKerrow, R. B., reviews and notices by, 86, 88, 120, 247, 373, 469
- McKillop, A. D., his *Samuel Richardson: Printer and Novelist* reviewed, 106
- Maclean, K., his *John Locke and English Literature of the Eighteenth Century* reviewed, 357
- Maid's Tragedy, A*, Q1 perhaps a "bad quarto," 43
- Malone, K., note on *Annot and Johon*, 327; his ed. of *Widnith* reviewed, 235
- Manly, Professor J. M., and Froissart's account of Chaucer's Embassy in 1377, note by H. Braddy, 63
- Marlay Letters, The: 1778-1820*, ed. R. W. Bond, reviewed, 478
- Marlowe, C., his *Massacre at Paris*, a "bad quarto," 30
- Marston, J., and Hamlet's Apotheosis of Man, 67
- Mawer, A., his *Place-names of Warwickshire* reviewed, 273; reviews and short notice by, 240, 493, 496
- Meres, F., part of his *Palladis Tamia* ed. D. C. Allen, reviewed, 88
- Merry Wives of Windsor*, 1602, "a bad quarto," 22
- Michaelangelo, note by K. Curry on uncollected translations of Michaelangelo by Wordsworth and Southey, 193
- Military service, summons to, in 1469..135; form of contract for in 1475..136
- Millican, C. Bowie, article on *Ralph*

- Knovett, Author of the "Supplement" to Spenser's "Faerie Queene,"* 44; review by, 206
- Milton, J., *The Works of John Milton*, ed. F. A. Patterson (Columbia University ed., vols. xi-xvii), reviewed, 349; *Milton and Wordsworth. Poets and Prophets. A Study of their Reactions to Political Events*, by Sir H. J. G. Grierson, reviewed, 225; reply to review by Sir H. J. G. Grierson, 458; *The Miltonic Setting, Past and Present*, by E. M. W. Tillyard, reviewed, 473.
- Mirror for Magistrates, A*, note by F. Pyle, 315
- Moore, J. R., note on the character of Daniel Defoe, 68
- More, R. P., his *Sources of the Faust Tradition from Simon Magus to Lessing*, reviewed, 239
- Morice, E. G., his ed. of *Grimmellos Fortunes and An Olde Man's Lesson*, by N. Breton, reviewed, 469
- Morley, Edith J., reviews by, 111, 371
- Mountfort, William, *The Life and Death of*, by A. S. Borgman, noticed, 244
- Murphy, J., a note on some plagiarisms of Sydney Smith, 199
- Murray, J., article on *Tancred and Gismund*, 385
- Murrie, Eleanore Boswell, notice by, 244
- Myrick, K. O., his *Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman* reviewed, 337
- Nahm, M. C., article on *John Wilson and his "Some Few Plays,"* 143
- Newdigate, B. H., his ed. of *The Phoenix and the Turtle* reviewed, 341
- Newspapers as a source of evidence for the relations between the stage and the authorities, 1700-1714, 53
- Newton, T. F. M., and the character of Defoe, note by J. R. Moore, 68
- New-Years-Gift, A*, by Ben Jonson, a note by Evelyn Simpson, 175
- Nicoll, A., his *English Theatre, a Short History*, reviewed, 218
- North, Christopher, see Wilson, J.
- Noyes, G. R., his *Hymns Attributed to John Dryden* reviewed, 348
- Olde Mans Lesson, An* (1605), by N. Breton, ed. E. G. Morice, reviewed, 469
- O'Sullivan, Mary I., her ed. of *Firumbras and Otuel and Roland*, reviewed, 461
- "*Otuel and Roland*," "*Firumbras*" and, ed. Mary I. O'Sullivan, reviewed, 461
- Overburian Characters, The, To which is added, A Wife*, by Sir Thomas Overbury, ed. W. J. Paylor, reviewed, 221
- Overbury, Sir Thomas*, his *Characters and A Wife*, ed. W. J. Paylor, reviewed, 221
- Oxford Companion, The, to English Literature* (2nd ed.), ed. Sir Paul Harvey, noticed, 243
- Oxford, Earl of, letter to Sir J. Paston, 1498..141
- Pain, P., his *Daily Meditations*, reproduced in facsimile with an introduction by L. Howard, reviewed, 357
- Palmer, P. M., his *Sources of the Faust Tradition from Simon Magus to Lessing* reviewed, 239
- Partridge, E., his *Literary Sessions* noticed, 246
- Paston, *Some New Paston Documents*, an article by C. F. Bühler, 129
- Patrick, D. L., his *Textual History of "Richard III"* reviewed, 468
- Patterson, F. A., his ed. of *The Works of John Milton* reviewed, 349
- Paylor, W. J., his ed. of *The Overburian Characters* reviewed, 221
- Peele, G., his *Edward I a "bad quarto,"* 36
- Percival, M. O., his *William Blake's Circle of Destiny* reviewed, 476
- Pericles*, 1609, a "bad quarto," 25
- Periodical Literature, Summary of, by M. Dowling, 121, 249, 377, 499
- Peyre, H., his *Shelley et La France* reviewed, 112
- Philips, Ambrose, The Poems of*, ed. M. G. Segar, reviewed, 475
- Phoenix and the Turtle, The*, by W. Shakespeare, B. Jonson, and others, ed. B. H. Newdigate, reviewed, 341
- Pinto, V. de S., reviews by, 223, 231

- Place-names of Warwickshire, *The*, by J. E. B. Gover, A. Mawer, F. M. Stenton, and F. T. S. Houghton, reviewed, 373.
- Plays about the Theatre in England from "The Rehearsal" in 1671 to the Licensing Act in 1737, by D. F. Smith, noticed, 497
- Pope, W. B., his ed. of C. A. Brown's *Life of John Keats* reviewed, 490
- Post-Horses, *Shakespeare and the Post-Horses: a New Study of "The Merry Wives of Windsor"*, by T. Crofts, reviewed, 93
- Potter, G. R., his *Hymns Attributed to John Dryden* reviewed, 348
- Praz, M., review by, 112
- Press, *Government and the*, 1695-1763, by L. Hanson, reviewed, 102
- Press, *The*, see Newspapers.
- Prouty, C. T., article on *George Gascoigne and Elizabeth Bacon Bretton Boyes Gascoigne*, 257
- Punctuation, see Hamlet's Apotheosis of Man; *Ralph Roister Doister*
- Puttenham, G., his *Arte of English Poesie*, ed. Gladys D. Willcock and Alice Walker, reviewed, 81
- Pyle, F., note on Thomas Sackville and *A Mirror for Magistrates*, 315
- Quartos, *A Census of Bad*, article by L. Kirschbaum, 20
- "queint device," a, in *The Tempest*, 405
- Radcliffe, Dr. John, and the proposed dispensary (1687), 453
- Ralph Roister Doister* (III. iv. 33 ff.), some earlier examples of the rhetorical device in, note by J. R. Kreuzer, 321
- Rawson, G., his tr. of L. L. Schücking's *Meaning of Hamlet* reviewed, 339
- Read, H., his collected volume of *Essays and Studies* reviewed, 240
- Reade, A. L., his *Johnsonian Gleanings*, Part VII, noticed, 498
- Reaney, P. H., review by, 373
- Renaissance, Wit and Rhetoric in the*, by W. G. Crane, reviewed, 466
- Restoration Stage, see Drama
- Revenge for Honour*, by H. Glapthorne, letter by F. T. Bowers, 329
- Reynolds, E., his *Early Victorian Drama* reviewed, 372
- Reynolds, Sir Joshua, *The Literary Career of*, by F. W. Hilles, reviewed, 231
- Reynolds, W. Vaughan, article on *Goldsmith's Critical Outlook*, 155.
- Rhetoric, see Wit
- Rhetorical device in "*Ralph Roister Doister*" (III. iv. 33 ff.), *Some earlier examples of the*, note by J. R. Kreuzer, 321
- Richard Duke of York, letter to Pgrave and others, 1452..132
- Richard II*, 16c8, the "Parliament sceane" of, 29
- Richard III*, letter to the abbot of St. Benet's, Holme, and others, 1485..139
- Richard III*, the Clock passage in, note by Hazelton Spencer, 205; *Richard III*, 1597, a "bad quarto," 27; *The Textual History of "Richard III"*, by D. L. Patrick, reviewed, 468
- Richard III, The True Tragedy of*, a "bad quarto," 35
- Richards, T., see C. Brown
- Richardson, Samuel: Printer and Novelist*, by A. D. McKillop, reviewed, 106
- Richmond, Margaret Countess of, letter to Sir J. Paston, 142
- Robinson, Henry Crabb of Bury, Jena, "*The Times*" and *Russell Square*, by J. M. Baker, reviewed, 232
- Romance in Iceland*, by Margaret Schlauch, reviewed, 238
- Romantic Ideal, The Decline and Fall of the*, by F. L. Lucas, reviewed, 233
- Romeo and Juliet*, article by H. R. Hoppe on II. vi and IV. v. 43 ff. in the first quarto version, 271; *Romeo and Juliet*, 1597, a "bad quarto," 21
- Rosa, M. W., his *Silver-Fork School. Novels of Fashion preceding Vanity Fair* reviewed, 245
- Rose, W., notices by, 245, 246
- Royal Society of Literature, *The Transactions*, vol. XVI, reviewed, 495
- Sachs, W., his *Der typisch puritanische Ideengehalt in Buryan's "Life and Death of Mr. Badman"* reviewed, 355

- Sackville, Thomas, and *A Mirror for Magistrates*, note by F. Pyle, 315; see Buckingham, the Complaint of
- Samuel Johnson's *Prefaces and Dedications*, by A. T. Hazen, reviewed, 359
- Sandison, Helen, note on the suggested ascriptions to Dyer and to Gorges of "But this and then no more," 449
- Saurat, D., reviews by, 228, 349, 473
- Scandinavian *Archæology*, by H. Sheltig and H. Falk, translated by E. V. Gordon, reviewed, 333
- Schlauch, Margaret, her *Romance in Iceland* reviewed, 238
- Schiller, *The Prestige of, in England: 1788-1859*, by F. Ewen, noticed, 246
- Schirmer, W. F., his *Geschichte der Englischen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* reviewed, 492
- Schücking, L. L., his *Meaning of Hamlet*, tr. G. Rawson, reviewed, 339
- Scottish Tongue, *A Dictionary of the Older*, Part VII, by Sir W. A. Craigie, noticed, 496
- Segar, M. G., her ed. of *The Poems of Ambrose Philips* reviewed, 475
- Selincourt, E. de, his ed. of *George and Sarah Green*, by Dorothy Wordsworth, reviewed, 111
- Seventeenth-century, *Francis Mercury Van Helmont: A neglected seventeenth-century contribution to the science of language*, article by Grace B. Sherrer, 420; *Seventeenth Century Studies presented to Sir Herbert Grierson* reviewed, 471
- Shakespeare, W., *The First Quarto Version of Romeo and Juliet*, II. vi and IV. v. 43 ff., article by H. R. Hoppe, 271; *The Staging of "The Tempest"*, III. iii, article by J. C. Adams, 404; *Hamlet's Apotheosis of Man—its punctuation*, note by R. J. Kane, 67; *The Clock passage in Richard III*, note by Hazelton Spencer, 205; *A Census of Bad Quartos* (Shakespearean and others), article by L. Kirschbaum, 20; *Costume in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*, by M. Channing Linthicum, reviewed, 91; *Shakespeare and the Post-Horses: a New Study of "The Merry Wives of Windsor"*, by J. Crofts, reviewed, 93; *Shakespeares Bilder: ihre Entwicklung und ihre Funktionen im dramatischen Werk*, by W. Clemen, reviewed, 213; *Shakespeare's Philosophical Patterns*, by W. C. Curry, noticed, 496; *The Meaning of Hamlet*, by L. L. Schücking, trs. G. Rawson, reviewed, 359; *The Textual History of Richard III*, by D. L. Patrick, reviewed, 468; *Titus Andronicus*, first quarto, 1594 (a facsimile ed. with an introduction by J. Q. Adams), reviewed, 86.
- Sheffield, J. B. Holroyd, first earl of, article by Marjorie C. Hill on his ed. of E. Gibbon's *Autobiography*, 440
- Shelley et la France, *Lyrisme anglais et lyrisme français au XIX^e siècle*, by H. Peyre, reviewed, 112
- Shelley, Mary, *A Biography*, by R. G. Grylls, reviewed, 487
- Shelley, P. B., *The Magic Plant: The Growth of Shelley's Thought*, by C. Grabo, reviewed, 365; *Shelley's Religion*, by E. Barnard, reviewed, 480
- Sheltig, H., his *Scandinavian Archæology*, translated by E. V. Gordon, reviewed, 333
- Sherrer, Grace, B., article on *Francis Mercury Van Helmont*, 420
- Sidney, Sir Philip, as a *Literary Craftsman*, by K. O. Myrick, reviewed, 337
- Sidney, Sir P., *Sir Philip Sidney and the Arcadia*, by M. S. Goldman, 206
- Silver-Fork School, *The*, by M. W. Rosa, noticed, 245
- Simpson, Evelyn, a note on Ben Jonson's *A New-Years-Gift*, 175
- Simpson, P., his ed. of *Ben Jonson*, vol. v, reviewed, 216; vol. vi reviewed, 344
- Sir Thomas Wyatt, a "bad quarto," 33
- Small, Miriam R., her *Charlotte Ramsey Lennox* noticed, 497
- Smart, C., a note by R. D. Havens on the structure of Smart's *Song to David*, 178
- Smith, Adam, plagiarized by Sidney Smith, 201

- Smith, D. F., his *Plays about the Theatre in England from "The Rehearsal" in 1671 to the Licensing Act in 1737* noticed, 497
- Smith, Edmund ("Rag"), note on his parentage by Elizabeth M. Geffen, 72
- Smith, Sydney, Some plagiarisms of, note by J. Murphy, 199
- Smithers, G. V., review by, 461
- Song to David*, by C. Smart, a note by R. D. Havens, 178
- Southey, R., note by K. Curry on his uncollected translations of Michaelangelo, 193
- Spencer, Hazelton, note on the Clock passage in *Richard III*, 205
- Spencer Redivivus*, note on the authorship of, by L. Bradner, 323
- Spencer, J., his *Death and Elizabethan Tragedy* reviewed, 346
- Spens, Janet, review by, 218
- Spenser, E., authorship of the *Supplement* to his *Faerie Queene*, 44; and the poetry of A. Gorges, 450; see *Spencer Redivivus*
- Stage, Elizabethan and Restoration, see Drama
- Stage, The, and the Authorities, 1700-1714*, article by A. Jackson, 53
- Stahl, E. L., review by, 239
- Stenton, F. M., his *Place-names of Warwickshire* reviewed, 373
- Strout, A. L., article on "*Christopher North*" on Tennyson, 428
- Summary of Periodical Literature, by Margaret Dowling, 121, 249, 377, 499
- Surrey, Thomas Earl of, letter to Sir J. Paston, 1487-1503. .140
- Sutherland, J. R., review by, 357
- Swift, J., note on the Canon of (*The Tripos Speech, The Fop*), by P. V. Thompson, 182; reply by H. Williams, 326; *Swift's Marriage to Stella together with Unprinted and Misprinted Letters*, by M. B. Gold, reviewed, 108
- "*Tancred and Gismund*," article by J. Murray, 385; comparison of the play with *Gismund of Salerne*, 395
- "*Tempest, The*," III. iii, *The Staging of*, article by J. C. Adams, 404
- Tennyson, A., article by A. L. Strout on "*Christopher North*" on Tennyson, 428
- Theatre, *The English Theatre, a short History*, by A. Nicoll, 218; see Drama
- Thompson, P. V., note on the Canon of Swift, 182
- Thomson, Gladys S., her *Life in a Noble Household, 1641-1700*, reviewed, 99
- Tillotson, A., notices by, 497, 498
- Tillotson, G., reviews by, 94, 97, 337
- Tillotson, Kathleen, reviews by, 173, 346, 466
- Tillyard, E. M. W., his *Miltonic Setting* reviewed, 473
- Titus Andronicus* (facsimile ed. of first quarto of 1594), with an introduction by J. Q. Adams, reviewed, 86
- Treble, H. A., his *A.B.C. of English Usage* reviewed, 375
- Vallins, G. H., his *A.B.C. of English Usage* reviewed, 375
- Van Helmont, see Helmont
- Victorian Drama, Early*, by E. Reynolds, reviewed, 372
- Walker, Alice, her ed. of *The Arts of English Poesie* reviewed, 81; review by, 468
- Walmsley, D. M., review by, 352
- Warwick, Richard Earl of, letter of, c. 1455. .135
- Warwickshire, The Place-names of*, by J. E. B. Gover, A. Mawer, and F. M. Stenton, in collaboration with F. T. S. Houghton, reviewed, 373
- Wecter, D., article on *Four Letters from George Crabbe to Edmund Burke*, 298
- Widsith*, ed. K. Malone, reviewed, 235
- Willard, R., article on *The Two Accounts of the Assumption in Blickling Homily XIII*, 1
- Willcock, Gladys D., her ed. of *The Arts of English Poesie* reviewed, 81
- Williams, H., note on the Canon of Swift, 326; reviews by, 106, 108, 230
- Wilmart, Dom André, his work on the Latin literature of the Assumption of the Virgin, 2

- Wilmot, R., his *Tancred and Gismund*, 385
- Wilson, J., article by M. C. Nahm on *John Wilson and his "Some Few Plays,"* 143; article by A. L. Strout on "*Christopher North*" on *Tennyson*, 428
- Wit and Rhetoric in the Renaissance*, by W. G. Crane, reviewed, 466
- Wordsworth, Dorothy, her *George and Sarah Green*, ed. E. de Selincourt, reviewed, 111
- Wordsworth, W., note by K. Curry, his uncollected translations of Michael-angelo, 193; note by H. Hartman on Wordsworth's "Lapland Night," 189; *Milton and Wordsworth*, by Sir H. J. G. Grierson, reviewed, 225; reply to review by the author, 458
- Wrenn, C. L., reviews and notices, by, 235, 238, 243, 246
- Wyld, H. G., his *History of Modern Colloquial English*, 3rd ed., noticed, 120
- Zatočil, Dr. L., his *Zur Gotischen Syntax: Quinan in und Vervandtes* noticed, 246



